THE CLERGY REVIEW

Vol. II. No. 6

Chairman, Editorial Board: HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

Editors: The Rt. Rev. Mgr. CANON MYERS, M.A., and the Rev. Dr. T. E. FLYNN, M.A.

DEC. 1931

THE PRIEST'S LIFE IN ITS ENVIRONMENT TO-DAY. 1. Health for Holiness. By the Rev. T. E. Flynn, Ph.D., M.A.

THE CENTENARY OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION. By R. H. Rastall, M.A., Sc.D.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON: An Echo from the Past. By the Rev. O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.SS.R.

For other Features and Full Contents see page iv.

THE UNIVERSE
1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2.

Monthly: £1 or 5 dollars per year post free.

ART MARBLES, STONE & MOSAIC CO., LTD.

12, BROADWAY, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

Telephones - - - - *Victoria* 0730 *and* 6969

Works : NEW MALDEN, SURREY. *Telephone : Malden* 1441 *and* 1442

Specialists in Ecclesiastical work in marble, stone and mosaic.

The Reverend Father Cyprian, Guardian of the Church of St. Francis of Assisi, Stratford, has placed with the Company an order for an Altar in Breche Corallina, Green Onyx, Breche Violette, Pavonazza, Mexican Onyx and other valuable Marbles.

ON RECEIPT OF A LETTER OR POST-CARD THE COMPANY WILL BE HAPPY TO SEND A REPRESENTATIVE TO DISCUSS PLANS AND ESTIMATES

ST. PATRICK

HIS LIFE AND MISSION

BY

Mrs. THOMAS CONCANNON, M.A., D.Litt.

With Illustrations. **6s. Net.**

"It is the virtue of Mrs. Concannon's new Life that, while fully aware of recent discussions on minor points as well as of the varieties of opinion on major questions, she allows non-essentials to fall into the background and once more sets before us the man Patrick in his burning spiritual ardour, his almost exaggerated humility, pouring out the sufferings of his tempest-tossed soul in his Confession or Apologia."—*The Times Literary Supplement.*

ROMAN LITERARY THEORY & CRITICISM

A STUDY IN TENDENCIES

BY THE

Rev. J. F. D'ALTON, M.A., D.D., D.Litt.

Professor of Greek at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth

21s. Net.

This book studies the main tendencies in Roman Literary Theory and Criticism. The forces of Tradition and Experiment in Roman literature, and the predominant position of Rhetoric, are studied. Incidently, many sidelights are given on the inter-relation of Greek and Roman Literary Theory.

LONGMANS

The Commonweal

A Weekly Review of Literature The Arts and Public Affairs

Edited and Published by American Catholic Laymen

A journal of opinion whose chief purpose is to apply Catholic principles to the discussion of present-day cultural and social interests.

"Much the best weekly review that exists."
—Compton Mackenzie.

Subscription: Six dollars a year

The Commonweal,
Grand Central Terminal, New York, N.Y.

LAVERTY & SONS, Ltd.

1, Hillary Place, LEEDS

DEVOTIONAL GOODS

Prayer Books
Rosaries
Crucifixes
Statues
Medals
Souvenirs of H. Communion
Pictures
Calendars, etc.

SEE . . . OUR GOODS
COMPARE OUR PRICES
TEST . . . OUR SERVICE

CHURCH METAL WORK

Chalices, Ciboria
Monstrances, Pyxes
Candlesticks, Vases
Sanctuary Lamps
Sacring Bells
Thuribles
Gongs, etc.

CHURCH CANDLES, &c.

Guaranteed percentage Beeswax. Votives, Incense, etc.

MISSION STALLS

Favourable "On Sale or Return" terms.

Telephone—VICTORIA 3932. *Telegrams*—"VANPOULLE, CHURTON, LONDON."

MAURICE VANPOULLE

MANAGER : L. C. APPLETON.

Ecclesiastical Embroiderer and Church Furnisher ::

260, VAUXHALL BRIDGE RD., WESTMINSTER, S.W.1.

(Near Victoria Station).

New Illustrated General Catalogue. 150 pages. Useful for reference. May we send you one?

VESTMENTS. SILKS. SACRED VESSELS. LINENS & LACE. CHURCH METALWORK. STATIONS OF THE CROSS. WOODWORK. ALTARS OF ALL KINDS. EVERYTHING FOR THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. IX., No. 4. *The Quarterly Journal of The Guild of St. Luke, St. Cosmas and St. Damian* **OCT., 1931**

Leading Article : The Holy Father graciously recognises the *Catholic Medical Guardian.*

Special Articles : (1) British Medical Association Annual Meeting. Catholic Medical Guild Conference. (2) Catholic Action for Doctors. (3) Birth Control Teaching and Maternity and Child Welfare Clinics. (4) Ministry of Health Birth Control Circular 1208. (5) Protest by the Catholic Women's League.

Notes and Comments : Coming of Age of the Guild. Preparing for 1932 Guild Conference. Our Eastbourne Meeting. Activities of Members.

Original Articles : (1) Pre-Reformation Hospitals, by George Parker, M.A., M.D., M.R.C.S. (2) The Question of the Creation of Man, by Rev. J. O. Morgan, D.D., Ph.D., L.S.S. (3) A Phenomenal Lourdes Cure, by John J. A. Sherry, L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S. (4) The "Safe Period" an Established Certainty, by Raoul de Guchteneere, M.D., Brux. (5) Right of the Unborn Child, by Rev. Vincent McNabb, O.P., S.T.M. (6) Prince of Wales' Visit to Lourdes, by Dr. John J. A. Sherry.

Obituary, etc.

Reviews and Notices of Books.

Deontology : (1) Responsibility of Chemists and Druggists in the Sale of Contraceptives. (2) Fasting before Holy Communion. (3) The Rights of the Unborn Child.

Publishers : Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London

Price : 1/4 (Post Free). (Annual 5/-, Post Free)

Subscription for United States $1.50

All enquiries to : Editorial and Manager's Offices, 3, St. John's Rd., Harrow-on-the-Hill, Mdx.

STUDIOS FOR ECCLESIASTICAL ART

BEYAERT — BRUGES

ESTABLISHED 1842.

Church Furniture : Stations of the Cross : Painting : Carving : Stained Glass : Embroidery.

Books Foyles can supply *all* your requirements. Special Department devoted to books on Theology and Allied Subjects. In 24 other Departments there are nearly 2,000,000 volumes (new, second-hand, out-of-print,) on *all* subjects. Write for Catalogue 192 (gratis) outlining requirements and interests.

Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.2 (Gerrard 9310) **Foyles**

GALLAHER'S HOTEL

(Late Bushwells)

25-26, Molesworth St., DUBLIN.

Centrally situated opposite Museum and National Library. Tel.: 62971. Garage. For terms apply Manageress

THE CLERGY REVIEW

PATRONS.

His Eminence CARDINAL BOURNE,
Archbishop of Westminster.

His Eminence CARDINAL MACRORY,
Archbishop of Armagh.

Their Graces the ARCHBISHOPS OF CARDIFF, TUAM, CASHEL, BIRMINGHAM, AND ST. ANDREWS AND EDINBURGH.

EDITORIAL BOARD.

The Most Rev. RICHARD DOWNEY, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D.,
Archbishop of Liverpool (Chairman)

The Presidents of the English Seminaries at home and abroad and the Joint Editors:

The Right Rev. Mgr. E. CANON MYERS, M.A.,
President of St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, Ware.

The Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.,
Vice-President of St. Joseph's College, Upholland.

With the collaboration of:
The Right Rev. Mgr. CANON GEORGE, D.D., Ph.D., and
The Rev. JOHN P. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

DUBLIN
ST. STEPHEN'S HOTEL
73, St. Stephen's Green
This hotel occupies an unique position overlooking St. Stephen's Green Park, adjacent to University Church. Select, comfortable and up-to-date, excellen' cuisine, separate tables. Special terms to clergy. **Apply—Miss Murray,** *Proprietress.*
Phone: 51631

BRAY
DUNALAN HOTEL
(Esplanade)
Charmingly situated, sea and mountain air. Ideal for priests requiring restful holiday, good table. Own farm produce. Well recommended. Terms moderate. Free Garage. Phone: Bray 88.

DUBLIN
HOTEL LENEHAN, 25, Harcourt Street.
Central position, 1 minute churches and St. Stephen's Green Park. Comfortable, Homely, Moderate. Apply Miss C. Lenehan, Proprietress.

LONDON:
Hamilton House, 20-21 Bernard Street, Russell Square. W.C.1
Near St. Pancras, King's Cross, Euston Stations. Ideal for Clergy. 5*s.* per night, 25*s.* per week. Well recommended (Catholic proprietress)
Phone: Terminus 6774.

(BRAY)
STRAND HOTEL ESPLANADE.
This hotel occcupies an unrivalled position on sea front, commanding views of Dublin Bay, Killiney Hill and Bray Head. Most Comfortable. Moderate terms. Proprietress, Miss Meaney, late Hotel (Stafford), London.

THE CLERGY REVIEW
The ideal medium for advertisements to the Clergy. Apply for terms to The Advertisement Manager,
The Universe,
1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2.

CONTENTS

DECEMBER, 1931

PAGE

ARTICLES :—

1. The Priest's Life in its Environment To-day (1) Health for Holiness,
   By the Rev. T. E. Flynn, Ph.D., M.A. 481
2. The Centenary of the British Association,
   By R. H. Rastall, M.A., Sc.D. 492
3. The Epistle to Philemon, An Echo from the Past,
   By the Rev. O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.SS.R. . . . 502
4. " Men of Little Showing " (7) Bishop Giles,
   By the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Provost Moriarty, V.G., D.D. 513
5. One More Word for the Sea-Apostolate,
   By the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. 521

HOMILETICS :—
By the Rev. Leonard Geddes, S.J. 528

NOTES ON RECENT WORK :—

(1) Liturgy,
By the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Canon Myers, M.A. . . . 537

(2) Ascetical and Mystical Theology,
By the Rev. Father James O'Mahony, O.M.Cap., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. 541

(3) Ecclesiastical Art,
By the Rev. Ivor Daniel 545

ROMAN DOCUMENTS :—
By the Rev. A. Bentley, Ph.D., M.A. 550

BOOK REVIEWS 554

REVIEW OF REVIEWS 567

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Courting and Mixed Marriage. Preparation for Marriage,
By the Rev. E. J. Mahoney, D.D. 572

Plainsong for the People,
By the Rev. A. McDonald 576

PROPRIETORS.

" THE UNIVERSE "
(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)
1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2.

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE PRIEST'S LIFE IN ITS ENVIRONMENT TO-DAY

I. HEALTH FOR HOLINESS

By the Rev. T. E. Flynn, Ph.D., M.A.

THERE is probably not a bishop in England who has not experienced a difficulty in finding a sufficiency of priests for the needs of his diocese. That difficulty is not primarily due to a lack of suitable candidates but to a dearth of funds. Notwithstanding the fine heritage of our seminaries established and conserved by the sacrifices and zeal of a past age, notwithstanding the yearly sacrifices and persistent generosity of the laity rich and poor, the number of vocations has to be curtailed for financial reasons. At a moderate estimate the education of a priest costs £2,000.[1] No matter whether that sum has come from his parents or from the diocese, that is the priest's money-value as he stands before his bishop on his ordination day; and if, as sometimes happens, within a few months of his ordination he becomes unfit for further work that money is an almost total loss; but not the whole loss, for he may have to be maintained as long as he lives. This is perhaps a crude way of regarding the young levite, and if he be a sick man it might be considered a cruel way. I am dealing, however, not with persons but with averages, and though statistics are proverbially misleading they do sometimes, as here, bring us up sharply against a salutary truth. The truth which The Clergy Review undertakes to ventilate in these articles is that it behoves everybody concerned to do his best to turn the student out of college fit for

[1] This rough estimate takes account not only of the student's pension during thirteen years, but also of the large proportion of students who at various stages abandon their project of becoming priests.

the arduous work that lies before him, to preserve him from avoidable ill-health when he goes on the mission, to secure for him as long a life of usefulness as possible. This responsibility rests upon the seminary authorities,[2] upon parish priests and, not least, upon the subject himself. It is an arithmetical fact that if a priest dies young his death is a toll upon a fund that is strictly limited and at best inadequate. This does not mean necessarily that the money has been wasted. Of many a young priest it can be said: "Being made perfect in a short space he fulfilled a long time." But a gap has been made in the ranks and that gap has to be filled.

Any carelessness of health, then, is apt to be criminal carelessness. That will be granted by most responsible people. In fact, they may feel that this argument is a knocking at an open door and that any insistence is a waste of effort if not a positive impertinence. There is no seminary which does not give much thought to the health of its students, no parish priest who would confess to a disregard of the health of his household, no priest who would not recognize that he lies under an obligation to God and his diocese to have a proper care of his health. But in spite of the recent advances in hygiene many are still ignorant of its elementary principles, many more are ready to deride them as fads, and more still perhaps entertain a reasonable fear of producing a valetudinarian clergy by too great an insistence on rules of health. Every one of us will confess that he has much to learn in this matter, and the more enlightened we are the more eager shall we be for further information from the expert. The fancy of the "faddist" may with expert illumination appear as the fact of a prudent man. With these aspects of the question the present writer has no competence to deal; his is the humbler task of mapping out the field of enquiry, of indicating the various sections which will engage the attention of experts, of showing the need and usefulness of each section; but throughout he will endeavour to prove that in undertaking this series of articles THE CLERGY REVIEW

[2] Pope Pius X when Patriarch of Venice wrote: "It is my wish to watch the progress of my young men, both in piety and in learning, *but I do not attach less importance to their health* on which depends in great measure the exercise of their ministry later on." Quoted by Fr. W. J. Lockington, S.J., *Bodily Health and Spiritual Vigour*.

has not abandoned the old ideals of Christian stoicism and self-forgetfulness as part of the priestly character, has not condescended to the softness of a self-indulgent age, has not been misled by the modern cry of Health for Health's sake, but is pleading for a more intelligent self-discipline, a more painstaking thoughtfulness, a truer estimation of values, a concern with Health for God's sake, Health for Holiness.

" Our forefathers . . . were accustomed to hear from Fr. Baker, who only gave utterance to the old mystical tradition, that a state of robust health was positively a disqualification for the higher stages of the spiritual life." This note of warning from Fr. Faber[3] is in our ears as we try to unravel this knotty subject. It will not do to dismiss it with the reflection that we are here considering the needs of workaday priests whose common-sense, if not their humility, tells them that they will never reach " the higher stages of the spiritual life "; for priests, of all men, must aspire to holiness whatever be the shortcomings they recognize in their actual performance. It is not to the present purpose to analyze the undoubtedly true meaning behind Fr. Baker's words; but one thing he certainly did not mean and that is that anyone has a duty or even a right to be contemptuous of what concerns his health. The whole tenor of that sanest of spiritual books, *Sancta Sophia*, is diametrically opposed to such a doctrine. Such contempt is not the " indifference " of St. Francis de Sales which means a willing acceptance of all the trials that God sends or permits; it is not to be confounded with St. Ignatius' Third Degree of Humility. It is out of harmony with the whole spirit of the Church, with the wise provisions of the founders of the severest religious orders. St. Ignatius commanded that " all those things be put away and carefully avoided that may injure, in any way whatsoever, the strength of the body and its powers."[4] And the saint of Avila bids her children to " take care of the body, for the love of God, because at many other times the body must serve the soul."[5]

The truth is that health is to be sought and treasured

[3] *Growth in Holiness*, p. 142.

[4] Cf. the very useful little book by Fr. Lockington, mentioned above.

[5] *ib*

not as an end but as a means. If in the pursuit of a nobler object a priest gives less consideration to his health than would satisfy an ordinarily prudent medical adviser, we know that he may be more than justified in his course. No physiologist would have approved the diet of the Curé d'Ars. It is a well-known principle of Ethics that a man may meritoriously mortify himself to the extent of shortening his life. And it is quite probable that such a man would do far more and better work for souls than the person who allows a fear of ill-health to control his spiritual activities. But men of this type are rare, and in view of the ordinary ascetical teaching it is to be supposed that they are acting under a divine inspiration which is not vouchsafed to more ordinary souls. These are warned that even in the pursuit of sanctification they are to have a prudent regard for their body. And while his personal holiness is undoubtedly one of the chief factors in a priest's efficiency, he must always remember that those very activities in which the body is a partner are the most obvious means of sanctification at his disposal.

This somewhat academic discussion is directed rather to the clearance of the ground than to the establishment of the case in hand. For we shall here be considering rather our care for the health of other people than care for our own, and where the insistence is upon a due regard by the priest for his proper health it is directed against a carelessness for which no such excuses can be found.

HEALTH FOR EFFICIENCY.

In the ordinary way of nature it is obvious that reasonably sound health and vigour of body are necessary for a priest's work. His life is distinctly arduous. The Saturday night with perhaps three or four hours of concentrated thought in the used-up air of his confessional may be followed by a Sunday on which he must endure a long fast, say two masses separated by a considerable interval, preach once or twice or oftener, go out in his district, take dinner at an awkward hour, and then take some part in an evening service. Many priests have such week-ends for the larger part of their lives, and we are so familiar with them that we are apt to think lightly of them; but as a matter of fact they are a tax on the strength of the strongest, and to be sure

of finding himself adequately fit to cope with this strain the priest must have a prudent care of his body.

During the week he may be called to attend infectious cases, and if he is at all run down his chances of catching some disease are multiplied. He has to be ever ready to comfort and console the suffering, to brighten the lives of the poor whom he visits, to encourage those who are struggling with temptations and difficulties of various kinds. All this is much more difficult if he has poor vitality. On many a day there may be no urgent duty and the man of feeble health will be tempted to stay at home when he ought to be about his Father's business. If then attention to details of hygiene holds a promise of more ready service on the part of the body, surely it is reasonable to bestow more thought on such details.

FOOD AND HEALTH.

The first thing to engage our attention must be the matter of food. Any discussion of food is apt to be looked at askance by ordinarily good priests. Every spiritual writer warns us against a preoccupation with food. The fact is that food is so intimate to our sense of well-being that without a considerable detachment from its allurements nobody is going to travel far along the path of spiritual progress. Certainly then nobody who is anxious to prepare good priests, nobody who recognizes that a priest's ultimate value is in proportion to the closeness of his union with God, will do anything to set a snare for him in this matter, to bait the traps of the Devil and the Flesh.

But we must eat and we should eat for the profit of our health. And it is the merest physiological fact that healthful eating means eating with appetite and relish. These things demand a propriety in the elements of food and care in the cooking of food. Therefore, while it is incumbent on the eater to avoid the snare of self-gratification and it is incumbent on superiors to teach him this lesson; while he must recognize that to eat with pleasure is no sin, but to eat merely for pleasure is a sin; it is the duty of the provider to attend to the physiological values of the elements of food and to good cooking.

The first of these considerations is the province of the science of dietetics. An enormous amount of research

has been devoted to this subject in recent years. Vitamins have emerged from the twilight of fable into the bright region of scientific fact. Why should we ignore them? Prisons, reformatories and the public services have the benefit of the research, why should not our seminaries and presbyteries have it too? It is not degrading, it is not softening, it is not more expensive. It asks for nothing but a readiness to receive expert advice and to pay attention. I do not wish to cavil, I do not suggest that much has not been done. For the sake of illustration I may be forgiven a personal reminiscence. The seminary in which I spent my teens was admirably cared for in all its details by the President, Canon Banks, the most self-forgetting and the most devoted of men—may his name be in benediction! He was most liberal in the provision of what he considered to be excellent food, and *mirabile dictu* (he would have loved the tag!) his students were satisfied that they were uniquely favoured in this regard. And yet, to the best of my recollection, we never had green vegetables from one year's end to another, never had jam except on a rare " open tart " or in a pudding, never had uncooked fruit, never porridge, never milk (except a generous allowance in our tea and coffee). The boys looked strong and well-nourished, and the President rightly boasted that for years a doctor had not crossed the threshold. But there were many days lost in petty sickness, annual epidemics of influenza colds (most carefully nursed), many of those disorders of circulation and digestion which were calmly accepted as being almost necessary to healthy adolescence, and, I suspect, a large annual sum paid over to the local chemist! Much of this and possibly more serious troubles might have been avoided had the information which is now broadcast been available in those days.

Let not all this be interpreted as a lack of loyalty to my Alma Mater or of respect to a man whose memory I hold in the most affectionate and grateful esteem. I still doubt whether other seminaries in that day were in better plight, and Canon Banks was far too generous and enlightened a man to practise economies in what he considered as essentials. As a matter of fact, I am told that a few years later he considerably improved this dietary along the lines here indicated. My present

contention is that as we have undoubtedly advanced on the past we must still keep our minds open to learn and try to keep abreast of modern information.

A glance at the latest Report from Besford Court, where Dietetics have been carefully studied, would, I think, evoke support for that view. There are many who are still content to spend generously on what is undoubtedly excellent food, but to give too little care to variety and to certain essential elements. A young priest once went on supply to a country mission. His first meal consisted of a mutton chop followed by a rice pudding. "I liked that," he said in compliment to the benevolent housekeeper as she cleared the table. And he got it—every day except Fridays as long as he stayed. It was very good food!

It is easier to provide proper food than to ensure satisfactory cooking. As long as there are cooks in the world, good food will occasionally be spoiled by their carelessness or inefficiency; and it would ill-become any man with any pretension to even homely virtue to grumble about the inevitable. But that does not exonerate those responsible for the cooking from the sins of carelessness and of wastage of God's good gifts. The sufferer should obviously accept the opportunity of patience and do his smiling best with the tough steak or stodgy pudding or burnt porridge; but the cook should strike her breast in humility, and the person whose unenviable office it is to control the cook should not rest satisfied to take credit for having supplied an occasion of virtue for his brethren: after all, it is just possible that the occasion will not be accepted. It is all so obvious as not to require mention, but is there one of us who has not seen every one of these obvious supernatural reactions to a regrettable situation not merely inhibited, but reversed?

If there is one principle of ascetics which more than any other should govern us here it is love of poverty. Efficient cooking I am prepared to believe is a true economy, though it may involve the use of modern kitchen utensils and devices which are mysteries to me. All this will be the matter of future discussion in this series.

There are some good men who are apt to say: "I cannot be bothered with these details. Anything that

is food is good enough for me." This may be virtue, and if it is we must be content to salute it respectfully and pass it by. But facing facts as we find them we shall agree that a man who speaks like this is, as a rule, a man of slight sensibility who eats a hearty meal of the food that he likes. There is much to be said physiologically for being guided by appetite as long as appetite is kept within bounds. But these men are rather shirking a difficulty than practising holy indifference. A carefulness of diet in respect of both quantity and quality would probably be much more irksome to them than the rude readiness to to take whatever the housekeeper chooses to send up. Moreover, if the priest has charge of others he must remember that they may not be as elastic in their receptivity as by nature he is.

Anyhow the danger of over-interest in food and drink is a danger of allowing creatures to intervene between oneself and God; and this danger is greatly diminished when the motive is an explicit will to preserve one's health for God's sake.

Nor does such thoughtfulness necessarily lead to valetudinarianism. That is a neurotic state which is more apt to be fostered by irregularities of diet and digestion. And presumably the attention is to be the responsibility of a man of mature age and stable disposition, who is working on behalf of younger men, and these are only too likely to be completely oblivious of all the care that he has taken. This is no plea for softness, but for reasonable hardness, for discipline as opposed to the slackness and laziness of routine.

EXERCISE FOR HEALTH.

The tonic effect of these considerations as a call to a sharper discipline will be more easily recognized when we turn to the relation of exercise to health. No priest can with a good conscience habitually give himself up to a mere luxury of physical games. Any man with a sense of the value of a priest's time will scrutinize carefully the higher limit of the amount of his reasonable recreation. That we may at present take for granted. It is the lower limit which demands our attention here. Of course, exercise is not the same thing as recreation, though often both are accomplished in the same manner

and at the same time, and the necessity for one or the other or both is so completely personal a matter that no definite controlling rules can be laid down. Some men maintain that they get exercise enough in a game of billiards, and others can find adequate recreation in physical jerks. But the doctors will insist that everybody needs fresh air, some degree of physical exercise (at least up to old age), and a certain amount of recreation to relieve mental stress. In the first two of these there is no danger of self-coddling. Most men as they approach middle life are far more inclined to settle down to arm-chair habits than to take a brisk "constitutional" or to play regularly a short outdoor game. But unless the body is to become flabby and generally inefficient this tendency must be resisted. Fr. Lockington[6] would have us eschew easy chairs altogether, habitually keep our bodies in a tonic "position," and practise definite exercises daily. There is nothing soft or self-indulgent about all that. On the contrary it opens the way to quite definite and habitual mortification.

In every seminary students are encouraged to take fresh air and exercise. They can often spend their recreation time in such external occupations as gardening, digging, harvesting. As an alternative to games these are quite excellent. But very often there is no compulsion about the matter especially with senior students, and there are some who at this period of their career by failing to avail themselves of the opportunities provided sow the seeds of serious trouble which will develop in the near future. Also there are laws or customs restraining lounging and shambling habits. In the formation of these traditional rules our forefathers showed a prudence which often escapes modern eyes. The hollow-chested youth who drifts about with hands in his pockets and sagging head and shoulders is not rendering himself more immune from the lung troubles which are a constant threat in a climate like ours.

THE PRESBYTERY.

It is not only out-of-doors that fresh air must be sought. as a leader writer in *The Times* reminded us the other day the battle for fresh air indoors and outdoors, night and day, was fought and won at the end of the Victorian

[6] *Op. cit.*

era. The good health of the clergy demands attention to this matter within the house.

It has long been recognized that for very many reasons the priest should find a reasonable degree of comfort in his home. Every one knows that lately there has been a great advance in internal domestic planning. The " ideal home " for the priest will differ very greatly from the sort of thing whose details are described in every illustrated journal or magazine. But an ideal there should be, and that ideal is likely to exclude the ill-ventilated rooms, the draughty passages, the smoking chimneys, the dust-harbouring furniture with which most priests have made acquaintance at some time or other.

A strict attention to perfect cleanliness is essential not only in the living rooms but even more in the kitchen quarters. It is true that well-cooked and palatable food often emerges from kitchens which we might fear to examine at close range. But the day is past when we may take comfort from the care-free philosophy of " What the eye does not see the heart does not grieve about." There are still too many people who will not believe in germs because they cannot see them, who are careless of anything smaller than a cockroach. Dirt harbours enemies more insidious and dangerous than any cockroach. The standard aimed at should be that of the hospital, and this can be achieved without the smell of iodoform with which it may be associated in some minds. The " Electrolux " and its rivals are worth the money spent upon them.

House-building and house-keeping call for something more than tradition and rule of thumb. Much thought and attention might well be bestowed on wise planning, on central heating, and on labour-saving devices. Architects do not always realize the necessary characteristics of a satisfactory presbytery; housemaids are often given too much to do and sometimes are as slack as a non-interfering rector will allow them to be.

Much depends upon the housekeeper. So many qualities go to the making of a good priest's-housekeeper that it is not surprising to find that the combination of them all in one woman is a rare phenomenon. The amazing thing is that it is not rarer. We all know many such women, faithful, dependable, discreet, capable, exemplary

in piety, tireless in their devotion to the needs of the clergy. They are in a very true sense co-operators in the pastoral work and they will one day reap a great reward. Often enough their reward is not very great in this life. It is small wonder that when a priest finds one he is very loath to part with her. In fact, a woman with only a few of the most essential qualities may be engaged or retained in spite of the most glaring defects. It does not need much experience to enable one to sympathize with the priest who advertised: "Wanted. Priest's Housekeeper. Deaf and Dumb." If the time comes when for one reason or another the priest has to lose his housekeeper, he often finds the greatest difficulty in replacing her. Yet there must be plenty of women in the country who would be competent to make good housekeepers and who would be glad to take such posts. Is there no means of bridging the gap between the supply and the demand? It would not seem impossible for some religious order of women to take up the work of training candidates and of serving as an agency. There is such an organization for men in Germany. Is there any intrinsic reason against setting up one for women here? The course of training might include, in addition to general housekeeping, simple cooking, economic marketing, and even sacristy work.

Here then are some of the considerations affecting the health of the clergy which will be dealt with by well-known experts in successive numbers of The Clergy Review. If as the result of their contributions it is borne in on some of us that we must give painstaking thought to sundry matters of health, that some ingrained habits of self-indulgence have to be abandoned or modified, that disciplinary activity is called for; and if we undertake these efforts not with any selfish motive but out of a regard for the obligations of our state; surely we may hope that our endeavours will be blessed and will be for us a means of holiness. And if the articles result in a more enlightened care of those whose health is to some extent in our charge this effect will be profitable to God's Church and well-pleasing to the Master Whom we all desire to serve.

THE CENTENARY OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION

By R. H. Rastall, M.A., Sc.D.,
Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.

JUST one hundred years ago, in the city of York, there came into being an organization which has undoubtedly had a considerable influence on the trend of thought in this country during its existence. This body is the British Association for the Advancement of Science, whose centenary was celebrated in London in September, 1931, under the presidency of General Smuts. It perhaps affords an interesting subject for reflection, with almost infinite ramifications and side issues, that the man chosen to preside on this occasion should be an Imperial statesman of non-British descent, a distinguished graduate of Cambridge, who was, during the recollection of many, in arms against the Empire, and afterwards Prime Minister of one of its Dominions. This same statesman also played a prominent part in the peace negotiations at the end of the Great War. All this, however, is politics and history, and cannot here be pursued further. What we are now concerned with is the relation of science to religious thought in the last hundred years.

First of all it will be well to consider what was meant by the word "Science" at that time. It is clear from the initial programme of the Association that it was intended to connote what we now understand by the term "natural science": that is, chemistry, physics, zoology, botany, geology, mineralogy and so forth, in fact, what was then designated by the convenient term "natural philosophy." The changes in the meaning of the term "philosophy" afford in themselves a study of some interest: for instance, in Pepys' *Diary* we find that the body of scientific men who founded the Royal Society are often referred to as "the philosophers," whereas they were in reality almost entirely concerned with natural science, while the term "natural philosophy" in the middle of the last century had come

to connote what we now call Physics, as in the title of the classical text-book of Thomson and Tait. It is, indeed, rather remarkable to find that in 1831 the word "Science" was used in the title of the British Association in its completely modern sense of natural science. In view of the general tendency to pomposity of diction at that time we may indeed wonder that the name then chosen for the Association was as simple as it is. In course of time other sections, such as education, agriculture, economics, have been added to the scope of the Association, but its primary field was clearly natural science. With regard to the educational section it has been said, perhaps unkindly, that the original object of its institution was to draw off all the cranks and bores from the other sections: whether it has been successful in this object must be left to the general judgment of posterity. To the ordinary observer the answer would appear to be in the negative. It is at any rate clear that the proceedings of these later extraneous sections occupy the greater amount of space in the reports that appear in the daily papers of the present time: this affords a useful commentary on the tendencies of the age, as exploited by political journalism.

The establishment of the British Association was primarily due to the initiative of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society. The first suggestion of the scheme seems to have been contained in a letter from Sir David Brewster to John Phillips, then Secretary of the Yorkshire Society. Phillips was a geologist, the nephew and assistant of William Smith, and afterwards Professor of Geology at Oxford. Brewster's suggestion was eagerly taken up by him and by another geologist, the Reverend William Vernon Harcourt. The first meeting was held in the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, under the presidency of Lord Milton, a county magnate. At that time it was probably not possible to start off without a Lord in the chair, but having got him over, so to speak, the Association soon began to be controlled wholly by scientific men. For the second meeting at Oxford the President was William Buckland, Professor of Geology in that University; and the President of the third meeting, at Cambridge, was again the Professor of Geology there, Adam Sedgwick. It seems, however, to have been mainly fortuitous that geology was so

prominent in the earliest history of the Association. This matter of the general scope of the discussions at various times in its history will be discussed in some detail later, as it is a matter of much general significance.

In looking through the list of the leading spirits at the time of its foundation, the officials and members of the various committees, who, of course, were in point of fact the leading scientific men of the day, two things specially strike a modern eye, by comparison with recent gatherings of the same and similar type, namely, the absence of titles and the great numbers of clergymen.

In the list of officials and members of committees at York there was one baronet, an amateur geologist, one retired Colonial Governor (a K.C.B.), and one knight on a local committee in India. Sir David Brewster seems to have been knighted between the first and second meetings, and on the latter occasion the names of Sir John Herschel and three or four other titled persons appeared. All this affords a strong contrast to the serried ranks of knights who figure at all such gatherings at the present day. Men like Dalton, Faraday, Hooker, Airy, and Murchison were then merely esquires or doctors, and the greatest of these, Dalton and Faraday, never received any recognition from the fount of honour. Sir Humphrey Davy had died in 1829. This absence of titular distinctions is, however, to be correlated with the other point just mentioned as worthy of notice, namely, the large number of clergymen then eminent in the scientific world. It has always been considered that the clergy of the established church are ineligible for knighthoods, although they are often baronets or peers by inheritance, or even sometimes peers by creation.

To some extent this preponderance of reverend gentlemen in the scientific world was due to the statutes then in force in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and indeed the connection between Anglican orders and the tenure of fellowships did not cease generally till 1882, and some special cases even survived till 1926, mainly in the form of restrictions as to the headship of certain colleges. It followed, therefore, of necessity that a large number of the teachers of science in these Universities were clergymen, and among these many of the most famous, e.g., Buckland, Sedgwick, Whewell,

Henslow, Conybeare. At these early meetings there is no sign of any incompatibility between religion, or rather protestantism, and science. Among the members enrolled for the second meeting, in 1832, were the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishops of London and Oxford. All these details as to personalities may seem very dull and out of place here, but they are of some considerable importance in view of later events, when interest had largely shifted to the biological side. In 1832 at Oxford, zoology, botany, physiology and anatomy were all lumped into one section, and the members of the committee of this section do not seem to have been people of much distinction, except the secretary, Henslow, the Professor of Botany at Cambridge.

The *Report* of the York meeting is very short, running to only 91 pages, but that of the Oxford meeting is much longer: the two are paged continuously, making up a volume of 624 pages. This volume is of very great interest at the present time, as it consists very largely of long and comprehensive reports by the leading authorities of the day; reports commissioned at York and presented at Oxford, on the state of natural science one hundred years ago. Some of these, though, of course, hampered by an old-fashioned nomenclature, nevertheless have a strangely modern ring.

Thus the British Association came into being with considerable éclat: it was, however, somewhat difficult to maintain so high a standard, and it cannot be denied that about ten years later the meetings in various provincial towns were hardly so successful: in particular the gathering at Cork in 1843 seems to have been almost a fiasco. Considering the condition of means of travel at that time, among other factors, this is hardly to be wondered at. Furthermore, an idea got about that at these meetings there was an undue preponderance of the social side as compared with the scientific. This is always a difficulty in connection with peripatetic congresses, where each town visited in turn tries to go one better than its predecessors in the way of hospitality. The trouble arises from an excess of zeal. The Press of the day naturally seized upon this feature and *The Times*, in particular, appears to have carried on a campaign of ridicule and depreciation of natural science in general and of the British Association in particular.

A great deal of inside information as to the difficulties of this period is to be found in Sir A. Geikie's *Life* of Sir Roderick Murchison, who was one of the leading spirits of the Association throughout this period. In spite of all this, however, progress continued to be made in conformity with the rapid advance of science in general throughout the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria.

Meanwhile, at the very end of the year 1831 there occurred an apparently insignificant event which undoubtedly played an enormously important part in the development of nineteenth century science. On December 27th of that year there sailed from Devonport H.M.S. *Beagle*, under the command of Captain Fitzroy, on an exploring and surveying voyage round the world. Captain Fitzroy was himself a man of science of great distinction, and he was accompanied, as naturalist, by Charles Darwin. Now it is, of course, possible that Darwin *might* have worked out his particular theory of evolution by natural selection and the survival of the fittest if he had stayed at home and followed out a career as an ordinary biologist, but it is very improbable. There can be little doubt that it was the experiences of this voyage, the first-hand observation of the struggle for life in tropical jungles and on the vast plains of South America, his study of the peculiarities of island faunas and floras and all the other matters so clearly set forth in his accounts of that voyage, that turned his thoughts towards the necessity for some explanation of the wonders that he had seen—exactly as in the case of Alfred Russel Wallace, who arrived independently at similar conclusions under similar circumstances.

Now it is, of course, necessary to make it quite clear that Darwin and Wallace did not introduce the idea of evolution. That was already in the air, in its more modern forms in the work of Lamarck, for example, while Lyell's *Principles of Geology* is distinctly evolutionary in tone, although its author was not aware of the fact. For some years also before the publication of the *Origin of Species* Herbert Spencer had been preaching a doctrine of evolution. What Darwin did was to offer a *reason* for development from one form of life to another. Evolution and Darwinism are not synonymous, as only too many people seem to think, even now. However, it was not

for another twenty-eight years that the bomb of natural selection, prepared by Darwin and Wallace, exploded in the calm scientific circles of the day. In the interval interest in biological science in all its forms had greatly increased, owing to a brilliant band of naturalists who explored the remoter parts of the earth, such as the Himalayas, the Malay Archipelago, the Amazon, the islands of the Pacific and even the Antarctic, following on the pioneer work of Captain Cook and Sir Joseph Banks and a great number of French navigators.

For our present purpose the main result of all this was that interest in biological science was aroused to an increasing extent. It would not be true to say that biology then supplanted physical and chemical science, because these last also were undergoing a wonderful development, as is abundantly testified by, for instance, the celebrations in honour of Faraday and Clerk Maxwell in the present year. But the publication of the *Origin of Species* in 1859 brought things biological to a head.

At this point it will be well to consider briefly and in a very general way what was the position in England as regards the relations between science and theology. On the one hand the Anglican Church during the years now under review had been undergoing a more than usually acute phase of the dissensions that continuously rend that unhappy body, but on the whole, both sides, whether ultra-protestant or Puseyite, were what might be called orthodox in this respect. Modernism and the " Broad Church " were things of the future, and if there were people like Dr. Barnes and Dean Inge, at any rate they kept out of the limelight. The " liberalism," so often mentioned by Cardinal Newman, was indeed a mild and innocuous product, according to modern ideas. Again, the Protestant dissenters might for the most part be described as fundamentalists in the modern and American sense. On the other hand, there were a certain number of well-educated people, largely of evangelical and dissenting ancestry, who had been goaded into an attitude of revolt, largely by the dreariness of the Puritan Sunday and the length and dismalness of Protestant services. With many of these this revolt took the form of a very definite anti-Christian attitude. These people, who soon began to call themselves, or to be called, Agnostics, quite naturally jumped at the opportunities

afforded them by their own interpretation of the progress of natural science and in particular of the prominence then given to the biological doctrine of evolution in its various forms. Even if the means they took of propounding their own views were not always in the best of taste and often quite extraordinarily dogmatic in form, at any rate they cannot be accused of intellectual dishonesty. They were not out for the loaves and fishes; for a long while theirs was certainly the unpopular side: the social pull of the established church and its University adjuncts was very strong, and these institutions were then on the side of orthodoxy.

It was, of course, inevitable that when the idea of organic evolution had taken so strong a hold on the thought of the time its consequences and inferences were soon extended to the question of the descent of man. It is true that Darwin himself in his *Origin of Species* had said very little that was definite on this point, but his disciples soon made the necessary extensions of the doctrine in that direction. More especially, as might have been expected, the revolutionary and anti-theological group eagerly seized on this weapon against orthodoxy. The acute thinkers of the time, and they were acute and logical thinkers within their limits, immediately perceived the implications of the theory of descent with modifications as to the origins of the human race. A large number of quite worthy persons were seized with an unconquerable desire to claim kinship with the apes, but the proofs brought forward were not generally considered convincing.

It so happened that this movement came to a conspicuous climax at the meeting of the British Association at Oxford in 1860. Curiously enough it is now quite impossible to ascertain what exactly did occur on this famous and much-quoted occasion. The accounts to be found in various biographies of those present differ a good deal as to the words actually used, but the general trend of the incident is perfectly clear. At one of the meetings there was a discussion largely devoted to the descent of man, and the Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Wilberforce, whose ideas of humour seem to have been somewhat elementary, most unwisely allowed himself to ask Huxley whether he claimed descent from the apes on the side of his grandfather or his grandmother.

Huxley naturally jumped at the opening thus given: according to most accounts he muttered to himself: "The Lord has delivered him into my hands," and then, rising, he replied to the effect that he would rather be descended from an ape than from an eminent person who so misused his position and talents to pour ridicule upon scientific thought. That was certainly the sense of the reply, though Huxley himself admitted afterwards that he could not remember exactly what he said, and, as before mentioned, contemporary accounts differ a good deal in detail. However, the exact wording is unimportant: it is the general tone of the discussion that is significant as casting light on the mentality of the opposed schools of thought at that time. The whole incident was undignified and silly, though it has been glorified by many Victorian writers as a triumph of science over obscurantism. But the point really is, whether this kind of thing can really be regarded as science: is it not rather bigotry run mad?

This meeting in 1860 was the climax of this particular phase of discussion; after this it took for many years a less prominent place, although, of course, the subject of evolution in general continued to appear in the forefront of biological science. It is, therefore, remarkable to find the subject of the origin of man from the apes cropping up again in the Presidential Address at the Leeds meeting in 1927. The President, Sir Arthur Keith, devoted his address largely to a rehabilitation of Darwinism, and in the course of it there occurred the following remarkable words: "We reach the conviction that man's brain has been evolved from that of an anthropoid ape and that in the process no new structure has been introduced and no new or strange faculty interpolated." The important part of this sentence is contained in the last seven words. It is the psychological rather than the anatomical element that matters. Psychologically, this statement is simply untrue. If it were true it is unlikely that the august body to which it was addressed would ever have come into existence, and it does not yet appear that the gorillas of Kivu have published an illustrated account of the incursions of Mr. Marcuswell Maxwell into their domain.

All this, however, is extremely unprofitable in view of the fact that it is by no means clear what in this

connection is meant by an anthropoid ape. No really educated person ever supposed that man is descended from any one of the present types of anthropoid ape, or anything like one, while the mutual relations of the different early forms of man are always left very vague in such discussions. For example, it seems to be generally agreed that Neanderthal man left no descendants. All this cropped up again in full force at the Centenary meeting this year, but the subject may well be left here.

Turning now to physical science it will be well to mention one or two points of philosophical interest connected with the development of modern views (or rather hypotheses) concerning matter and energy. The history of physical science in the last half-century has been rather curious. Fifty years ago it was generally if tacitly assumed that almost the last word had been said on the nature of matter, which consisted of little hard indivisible lumps called atoms, bearing some kind of hooks by which they could be slung together in groups, called molecules. All this was quite satisfactory until Sir William Crookes began to pass electric currents through tubes nearly exhausted of air or other gases, when some very odd things happened. Then X-rays and radioactivity were discovered as well as Hertzian waves and the foundations of wireless. All this meant that classical physics and chemistry broke down and many hitherto unknown sources of energy were revealed. Even Newton's law of gravitation is now, in the light of the theory of relativity, held to be only approximately true, and many of the fundamental "laws of nature" are now regarded as merely statistical probabilities, with the odds so enormously in their favour that in practice they always work. But there is a wide philosophical difference between saying that a thing is transcendently improbable and that it is impossible.

The really important lesson to be learnt from the history of physical science in the last half-century is this: that just when it seemed that something like finality had been reached, new and far-reaching discoveries, to some extent accidental, upset the whole theoretical basis and led to an entirely new set of both physical and epistemological conceptions, such as are so ably set forth in Prof. Eddington's Gifford lectures and in the writings of Sir James Jeans, to mention only two

examples in a vast field of literature that has appeared during the last few years. With regard to one side at least of this vast subject, namely, the nature of the atom, it can fairly be said that it is acknowledged on all sides that the various presentations of Bohr, Schrödinger, Heisenberg, de Broglie, Dirac and others are to a large extent symbolical and do not set out to represent anything in the nature of ultimate reality. Neither is there anything much more definite in the quantum theory, which mainly serves to make the mystery more profound. The only reasonable conclusion is that all this cloudiness will be cleared up some day, but at present the fog only seems to be getting thicker. The modern scientific intellect with its muddled philosophies, seems to rejoice in mystifying itself: some day, no doubt, a new St. Thomas will arise, and there will be light.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

AN ECHO FROM THE PAST

By The Rev. O. R. Vassall-Phillips, C.SS.R.

THERE are times when St. Paul's readers must expect to find him sufficiently baffling. On the highest authority we know that it never has been otherwise. Moreover, to tell the truth, most of us—so at least I imagine—can hardly help the feeling sometimes stealing over us that the great Apostle is dealing with subjects that are now of dead interest. The sternest of all his fights was with the Judaizers, and—well—there are no Judaizers left. The battle with them was fought out long since, gloves off, to a finish, and securely won. Under God it is due to the Apostle of the Gentiles that Christianity was saved, by what seems to have been almost a personal victory, from the impending danger, humanly speaking, of sinking into a Jewish sect.

But no issue, once it is really dead, can hold men's attention for any length of time without fatigue, unless, indeed, they have an expert's interest in the subject. For my part I own that when I read St. Paul's attacks upon his Judaizing foes, notwithstanding my deepest sense of gratitude for the vindication of our liberties, I am always asking myself what those Judaizers had to say when they "answered back." The Apostle gives us no hint, but it is not hard for us to imagine for ourselves. They had their case. From their point of view it was an overwhelmingly strong case. Their mistake consisted in not realising that the Law of Moses had done its work, and in trying to put old wine into new bottles. To change the metaphor, they forgot that no one will sew a piece of old stuff into a new garment.

No doubt it was wise and fitting that the Synagogue should be buried with all due honour and even ceremony. St. James the Less and other Apostles saw without hesitation that this was so; one wonders whether St. Paul saw it quite as clearly as the rest. What undoubtedly he did see with piercing clearness was the danger lest there should be some Christians who might forget that the Synagogue was to be buried at all. As long as this danger was there, the Apostle of the Gentiles never forgot it for

an hour. It was always present to his eyes. We, descendants of the first Christian Gentiles, owe him unstinted thanks. We are his debtors for eternity.

Meanwhile, the ordinary Christian to-day who tries to read St. Paul intelligently has not heard much about Judaizers; often he does not even know the name. What wonder, then, that he is checkmated, and declares wearily that he will never understand St. Paul? Similarly with Gnosticism—at least that hybrid form of Gnosticism which in St. Paul's time was a danger to Christianity, has long since disappeared. Few things can be more annoying than to find the Apostle's contentions against Gnostic denials of our Lord's Godhead and solitary Mediatorship, by their "worship of Angels," twisted by Protestant controversialists, who know nothing whatever of his real meaning, to matters with which—demonstrably—they have nothing to do.

So strongly do I feel this that for many years I have thought it would be wise to forbid unequipped Catholics of the present day to read certain portions of St. Paul's writings at all, at any rate without notes of considerable elaboration—much longer notes than appear in the Westminster Version.

However this may be, it will indeed be a thousand pities if St. Paul's obscurities when he deals with theological questions—particularly with theological questions which are long since dead—should shut us out from the enjoyment of the keenness of mind—above all of the tenderness of heart—of the great servant and lover of Christ, to whom St. John Chrysostom has paid the noblest tribute one man has ever given to another, when he wrote: "*Cor Pauli, Cor Christi.*" It seems to me that if we are to have any hope of even suspecting the depth and riches of human feeling which lie hidden in the writings of St. Paul, the first thing which is necessary is to desert archaic English in our translation and to use our ordinary everyday speech. For instance, when reading the Epistle in English to the faithful from the pulpit at Mass, for many years I have taken the liberty of substituting "the Heart of Christ" for "the Bowels of Christ." It is not, of course, that I have the slightest objection in itself to a good old English word, but simply because I think that the phrase, "the bowels of Christ," may puzzle many of our excellent people, and will certainly stir no devotion

in their souls, whilst the familiar expression, "the Heart of Christ," will be exactly what they would expect, and may help them to love God.[1] Apart from the mere choice of words, I feel sure we shall do well to take St. Paul's expressions out of the conventions of his day and period, endeavouring to write as he would have written had it fallen to his lot to write to modern English folk, and to clothe his thoughts in modern English dress.

A slight examination of St. Paul's Letter to Philemon will perhaps convey some indication of my meaning.

The Letter to Philemon is so personal in its contents that doubts have been raised on this ground as to its inspiration, which, however, has never been doubted in the Church. It is one of the three Epistles of the Captivity—the other two being the Letters to the Ephesians and Colossians—which were written when the Apostle was in captivity, or rather, detained on a sort of *parole* in Rome. This imprisonment evidently was not strict; still he writes not only in this Letter, but also to the Ephesians and Colossians,[2] of his bonds and chains, so that it seems to be certain that he was bound in some kind of fetters, which while preventing him from working at his trade, will have given him more time to instruct his catechumens. It is even more fascinating to think of St. Paul than of St. Philip Neri centuries afterwards in Rome—Rome of all cities in the world the most wonderful even in its worst days,[3] the most colourful and now the most Christian—in St. Paul's time the very seat of Satan—in St. Philip's and in our own the seat of Christ's Vicar, the new Jerusalem, the Holy City of Christendom. But whether we think of Paul or Philip we shall find the same extraordinary activity, the same

[1] F. Prat, however (*The Theology of St. Paul,* Vol. II, p. 48, n. 5), would translate "the Compassion" or "the Mercy of Christ." St. Paul, Philippians ii. 1, uses σπλάγχνα (literally bowels) and οἰκτιεμοί in conjunction—"the compassion and the mercies of Christ" (translated in the A.V. "if any bowels and mercies!". In the R.V. "tender mercies and compassions"). Colossians iii. 12 σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, I think, can hardly be better Englished than by "bowels of mercy."

[2] Eph. vi. 20; Col. iv. 3.

[3] In *Marius the Epicurean,* p. 130, we read: "That old Pagan world of which Rome was the flower." I fancy that few will be found to disagree.

constant going to and fro—no one turned away, everyone welcomed—the same constant self-surrender for the love of Christ and of the souls of men.

There is no doubt as to the circumstances in which the Epistle to Philemon was written. Philemon was a rich inhabitant of Colossae, a town in the very heart of Phrygia (or in its neighbourhood), who had been converted to the Faith by St. Paul, together with several members of his family, amongst them his wife, Appia, and his son Archippus. (In the Epistle to the Colossians iv. 17, the Apostle had urged Archippus to discharge faithfully the ministry (διακονία)—it is not certain what was its nature—which he had received of the Lord.) There was a slave in the house named Onesimus, which in Greek means *profitable*. We all have read of the grossness and horrible cruelty of the barbarous outrages continually directed in the Greco-Roman world by owners, and even worse by *owneresses* towards their miserable bondservants; at the same time it was not invariably the case that slaves were harshly treated by their masters. Wholesale manumission would have been impossible—for obvious economic reasons. Indeed it would have been far worse for the slaves than for their masters. Especially where the head of the family had become a Christian and learned the lesson so earnestly taught by St. Paul of the essential equality before God of Bond and Free, that is of Slave and Master, there was but little, if any, wrongdoing in the working of this social arrangement. Detestable though the system was, of necessity it had to be tolerated for the moment in the interests of the slaves themselves, lest they should be thrown in misery upon the roads—as were the Monks and Nuns (whose whole manner of life was suddenly changed) in the days of our Eighth Henry. In any case, there is no reason to think that there was the slightest abuse in the household of Philemon at the time when the slave Onesimus escaped from it—as is almost certain—with a considerable sum of his master's money in his possession.

After this adventure Onesimus met St. Paul in Rome (or just possibly in Caesarea). He was unmistakably a Phrygian, as was made clear by his dress and language.[4]

[4] Not many years were to pass before Phrygia, to whose inhabitants St. Paul was so attached, became the principal seat of the peculiarly repulsive Montanist heresy.

The Apostle probably recognised him by sight (having seen him in the house of his master Philemon), took him home with him, and converted him to Christianity.[5] St. Paul tells us that he loved him as a son, whom he had begotten in his bonds (Philemon 10, 16), and that, had it been possible, he would have wished to keep him by his side to wait upon him. But it was not possible. With the baptism of Onesimus a case of conscience had arisen, which could only be solved in one way. It was the duty of Onesimus without avoidable delay to return to Philemon, in order to make what reparation and restitution should be possible. This return might, indeed, have involved terrible consequences—the Roman Law of the time authorized the master to inflict even the penalty of crucifixion upon a runaway slave, *pour encourager les autres*. But the duty was clear and might not be shirked. St. Paul, therefore, sent him back, but at the same time pleaded with Philemon not only for his forgiveness, but also for his manumission.

Such is the history of the letter. I will now give it as it stands, venturing to make my own translation somewhat freely—afterwards I will discuss it.

" Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy, a brother: to Philemon our beloved and fellow labourer, and to Appia our dearest sister, and to Archippus, our fellow soldier, and to the church which is in your house. Grace to you and peace, from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

" I give thanks to my God, always making a remembrance of you in my prayers, when hearing of the faith which you have in the Lord Jesus, and of your charity to all the brethren. May the generosity prompted by your faith be made evident through the acknowledgment of every good work that you have done by the grace of Christ Jesus. Yes, my brother, your charity, which has refreshed the hearts of the Faithful, has filled me with much joy and consolation. So although I have much confidence in Christ Jesus that I might command you

[5] Fr. Prat (St. Paul in the *Saints Series*, p. 179) writes that " one day St. Paul saw a poor stranger enter his room." But he gives no reason for his opinion, and if I may venture to differ from so eminent an authority, it seems to me to be more probable that St. Paul met him in the street.

to do what I want you to do, still for charity sake, I, Paul, prefer, as an old man and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ, to ask it of you.

" I beseech you for my son, whom I have begotten in my chains, Onesimus, who was at one time unprofitable to you, but now has become *profitable* both to you and to me. I am sending him back to you as part of myself. Please receive him so. I would have liked to keep him with me, that in your stead he might have ministered to me as a prisoner of the gospel. But I did not wish to do anything in the matter without your consent, that your good deed might not be forced on you, but be quite voluntary.

" Perhaps he left you for a time that you might receive him back again for eternity: not now as a slave, but instead of a slave, as a brother both in the flesh and in the Lord, most dear in a special way to me, but how much more dear to you? If therefore you count me as your partner receive him as you would me. And if he has wronged you in any way, or if he owes you anything, put it down to my account. I, Paul, write this with my own hand: I will repay the debt, but ought I not rather to remind you that you are my debtor and owe me yourself? Yes, my brother, let me receive this favour from you in the Lord! Make glad my heart in the Lord. I have written to you, counting on your obedience, and knowing that you will do more than I ask.

" And get a room ready for me. I am hoping that your prayers will be heard and that I shall be able to pay you a visit.

" Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus: Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke, my fellow labourers, all send you kind messages.

" The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your soul. Amen."

As experience shows, it is quite possible for this letter to be read, even after its meaning has been explained, almost mechanically, and without much impression being made on the mind of the reader. It is possible to read it and fail to appreciate any of its exquisite suggestiveness. But I think it will be otherwise if we forget Colossae, and think of it as of an ordinary breakfast table in our modern England. They are all there—father and mother and

children—when suddenly a little stir, even excitement goes round the room. A letter has arrived from St. Paul. Philemon begins to read it, at first to himself, but soon out loud. It does not begin conventionally: "Dear Philemon," but—"From Paul a servant of Christ Jesus to Philemon the well beloved, and our fellow labourer, and to Appia [St. Paul is far too wise a man to forget the lady of the house] and to Archippus, his fellow soldier," and to all the little Philemons—to all the Christian household. How pleasant it will have been for Philemon to hear himself dubbed "the fellow-labourer" and "the partner," or for Archippus to have been termed "the fellow-soldier" of the Apostle of the Gentiles—no mean titles! St. Paul will have them all on his side from the start. He knows that he has a difficult task ahead of him, and "for charity's sake" he will perform it as easily and pleasantly as lies in his power. Some people inform us that they are blunt men and believe in going straight to the point. Whatever we may ourselves think of this peculiarity, we must own that it was not St. Paul's way. Exactly a third of this short letter is taken up with praising Philemon up to the skies, and praising him above all because he had practised virtues in the past which St. Paul is determined to get him to practise in the immediate future.

"I thank my God," he writes, "always making remembrance of you in my prayers, as I listen to the story of your faith and love and generosity to the Christians."[6] There are people who are sadly chary of the praise they give to their dependents, and even to their friends. St. Paul gave his praise unstintingly with both hands. We shall admit this if we consider how startled the average curate would be were he one fine morning to receive a letter from his parish priest away on his holidays, in which he asked him to do something rather disagreeable, beginning his epistle by the assurance that he thanked his

[6] St. Paul begins his private letter to Philemon in practically the same terms, as those in which he is at the same time addressing the whole Church of Colossae (see Col. i. 1). With two exceptions St. Paul begins his letter to the Churches thanking God for their virtues. The exceptions are the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians. It is amusing to remember that the Apostle was angry with the Corinthians and very angry indeed with the Galatians when he wrote these letters.

God each day for giving him such an assistant in his work—thanked Him especially when he read letters from his parishioners dwelling on his curate's goodness, faith, charity, generosity.

Or let us go back to our English breakfast table, and place ourselves in some Lancashire house in the days when Cardinal Vaughan was laboriously building his great Basilica. The urn begins to splutter and hiss, but everyone is still feeling rather sleepy, grumpy and disinclined to talk, when there is a voice from the father of the family: "Here is a letter from his Eminence—it is his handwriting.[7] Let us see what he has to say. Here, Mary, do pay attention. Listen. He writes that you are very dear to him (of course it would not be put quite in that way, but in slightly different words), and John too, and all the rest of you, my dears. Really he does say SUCH kind things. He writes that the merchant princes of God's own County have never failed the Church when there has been question of supporting religion, and that I have walked in my father's footsteps, and actually that he thanks God every day for my goodness and devotion —very gratifying—very gratifying indeed, I am sure, though I do not deserve one half of it. John, see that you remember your family's traditions and keep them up all your life—and, yes, John, like a good boy, get me my cheque-book. Let us see what we can afford. I am sure that you will not mind, John, if for once in a way I dip into capital. Really we are disgracefully rich [this was before the war]. My poor father—the Cardinal mentions him—I feel sure would have wished it for a cause like this."

And so the princely gift is given, as a pleasure, and gladly. Very different would it have been if the Cardinal had written in another tone and with less care. Then we should, I imagine, have had something of this kind. "Another begging letter. This time from his Eminence. These priests seem to think one is made of gold and has no expensive family to keep. But I suppose one cannot very well refuse. John, bring me my cheque-book; it is

[7] St. Paul assured Philemon that he had written the letter he sent him "by his own hand." I hardly think that had the Apostle lived in an age of typewriters, he would have typed it, or dictated it. To have done either would have been in some subtle way to take away from the intimacy of the appeal.

better to get it over at once. How much must one send? He ought to know that with all the claims upon me I cannot afford much these hard days." And so the gift would not only have been robbed of all its pleasures and graciousness, but not much of its merit would have remained.

To return to St. Paul's letter. He knew that he would in the end have to come to his difficult request. So he will approach it by a delicate hint that he has a right to command. Evidently he held that the Apostles had a right to tax the Faithful, but as a prudent man he will hold this right in reserve. He will not use it if he can possibly avoid doing so.

" Though I have the right to command you, yet I prefer to ask you and appeal to your love, since I, Paul, am now aged and a prisoner of Jesus Christ. I beseech you for a son I have brought to the Faith in my prison-house." By this time Philemon's household is well worked up. What will they not do for this convert of St. Paul, sent to them by him from his captivity in Rome? Still, they have no notion who it can be. Sooner or later the Apostle has to tell them and must come to the point. He rushes at it with these words, " Onesimus." He is quite aware of the inevitable reaction. " What! Onesimus, the rascally slave! " How often may they not have said in their family confabulations what they would do if they could catch him. No one likes to be cheated. St. Paul, of course, knew this perfectly well, and did his best to turn away their annoyance by a pun! " Yes! Onesimus, who so far has not been true to his name. He has not been ' *profitable* ' to you." (I should think he had not been. He had gone off with their money!) " But now he will be *profitable* both to you and to me, so I have sent him back to you. Receive him as you would receive myself. (Rather a large order, we must admit!) I should like to have kept him by my side, that in your place he might have ministered to me in my loneliness." It is hardly necessary to dwell on the charm of the suggestion that St. Paul would have liked to have Philemon with him in his captivity, but as that was impossible, he longed to have Onesimus to remind him of his absent friend. " But without your consent, I wish to do nothing." And so our letter hurries to its close. " Without your free consent, I would do nothing—that you should have the

merit, that he should be yours for ever, in time and in eternity, no longer as a slave, but now as a brother, very dear to me, but how much more to you, since he belongs to you ' both in the flesh and in the Lord,' both naturally and supernaturally, both as a former member of your household, and now a brother in the Faith of Christ. At the beginning of my letter I called you my fellow-labourer, my partner; if you really would be such—well, then, receive Onesimus as you would receive me."

But how about the stolen money?

"*If* he owes you anything?" St. Paul knew there was no " if " about it, but an " if " sometimes has a wonderful effect in making a hard thing easy—" if he owes you anything, put it down to my account." I feel sure that St. Paul never meant to pay! Nobody will imagine that he thought for a moment that Philemon would let him do so; but it would break the annoyance of losing the money if by giving it up he would have St. Paul in his debt. He might say to his family: " The Apostle says he will owe it to me, but I shall not bother him over it." It would save his face.

St. Paul finishes by again reminding Philemon how on his side he owes, not a little money, but everything—his very soul—to the Apostle.

St. Paul has one last arrow left in his quiver, which he proceeds to draw. He tells Philemon that he is coming to stay with him, for he knows that Philemon has been praying for a visit from him! " Through your prayers I may be given to you "—and that he will manage it. We may be quite sure that on his arrival he will not find Onesimus a slave in that household.

Tradition tells us that all turned out as happily as we could wish. The name of Onesimus appears in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 9), where St. Paul writes of him as a " faithful and beloved brother who is one of you "—that is, of Colossae. This, of course, was before his manumission, but we also find his name in the Roman Martyrology as Bishop and Martyr.[8] Paul's prayer has been heard. Onesimus was indeed " profitable " to them all, " not for a season, but for ever."

The letter to the Colossians found its way to Philemon's

[8] Cf. Surius Vol. II, February 16th.

house. It was addressed, amongst other Christian Colossians, to them all; it was meant for Philemon, for the Lady Appia, for Archippus, for the other children, for the Christian slaves—for them all. The long centuries have rolled by since this letter was written and received. Now they are together in God's own Heaven. In his Epistle to Colossae St. Paul had written to every one of them: "Let your speech always be full of grace, seasoned with salt" (Col. iv. 6).

No one who has read this letter to Philemon will doubt that the great-hearted Apostle where people's feelings were concerned, so careful about little things, so loyal, so devoted to his friends, to Philemon and to Appia and to Onesimus, not only in his conversation but also when he wrote his private letters, took care himself to practise what he preached, to season his speech with salt. We all know how well it will be for us if in this, as in so many other things, we do our best to follow his precept and example, as he always followed Christ, walking in the footsteps of his Lord.

"MEN OF LITTLE SHOWING"

(7) BISHOP GILES.

By the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Provost Moriarty, V.G., D.D.

IT seems almost a paradox to write under this title of one who spent forty-six years at the head of a Papal and National College in the Holy City, twenty years as Vice-Rector and twenty-five as Rector and consequently as representative of all that was Catholic and English, in the very centre of Catholicism. Upon him in this position there beat a glare of light so great that one would say that not much could be hidden. Business of all kinds and degrees of importance bearing on public matters was always passing through his hands. He was frequently consulted in matters of grave import to Catholic England. Moreover, his life in Rome was spent in stirring times; there were the Garibaldian invasion of the Papal States, the Vatican Council and the taking of Rome by the Piedmontese troops in 1870. Yet, in spite of all this publicity, if there was ever a man of little showing it was Bishop Giles or, as he was better known throughout his long life, Dr. Giles. A further paradox is that he was a typical Englishman both in his physical appearance and in his attitude of mind; in his reticence, in his shyness and his fixity of purpose; and yet he lived all his life, at least his priestly life, out of England and largely out of touch with the movements that were affecting the Catholic Church there. He certainly did not wear his heart on his sleeve. He was shy and reserved even with the students with whom he mixed familiarly. He had little sympathy with the hurry and bustle of life even in the diluted state that it came to him in his work and life in the College. He lived much in the past, more than is usual even in the case of a very reserved man, and consequently seemed out of touch with people—the chance people with whom he came into contact. Hence legends are already growing round his name showing how deeply he was misunderstood. By one body of men he was never misunderstood, the students of the Venerable English College with whom

he daily and hourly came in contact. By these men, and they are surely the best judges, his name was and is held in the greatest affection and veneration.

His distinguishing characteristics—his intensely deep religious life and the supernatural way of judging men and things, his quiet and reserve, and his utter contempt and hatred of pretence and show—may have been hereditary in him. He came of an old City of London family—Quakers in religion; and in such families family tradition leaves its mark on the children. He was born in 1830 in London, and when he was fourteen years of age his parents became Catholics. He then went to S. Edmund's, Old Hall, and began to study for the priesthood. A companion of these young days was his orphan cousin, who was afterwards known as Mother Mary Loyola of the Bar Convent, York.

At S. Edmund's he showed himself a brilliant student and outclassed all his fellows. He matriculated at the London University taking seventh place in Mathematics. After he had received the tonsure he left S. Edmund's and spent five years in London attending the lectures at the University where he took his B.A. in 1850, third in Classics; and his M.A. in 1852, being first in Classics. He was the first Catholic to take the M.A. degree in that University.

That was the end of his life in England. He went to Rome, to the Pio College, and in 1854 was ordained priest. He then took a tutorship in Rome for a time and after this became Vice-Rector of the Pio, and in 1867 Vice-Rector to Mgr. O'Callaghan at the Venerabile when he succeeded Dr. Neve, and in 1888 he became Rector when Dr. O'Callaghan was appointed Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle. From this date of 1867 until he died in 1913 the English College was his home for forty-six years, and the care of the small body of students and their needs occupied him body and soul. He seems to have had no other interest in life but their welfare and happiness. He spared upon them neither trouble nor time nor his private means. Yet even with them it was difficult to rouse him to talk. He would sit silent amongst them and listen amused at the usual " Common Room " conversation with only an occasional enlightening remark. It was only rarely that he took a leading part in the conversation, and that was usually in

answer to some extravagant statement cunningly introduced that cut across some well-known predilection of his. Then he would show us some little of what there was behind that veil of reticence. It would have been much better for the students if he could have talked more and by his undoubted learning have helped them; but there it was. If those round about him saw so little of his mind and its accomplishments how little chance was there of outsiders coming to an approximately true valuation of his worth?

That was one source of his being unknown to men who were brought into contact with him in relation to the affairs of the Church in England, but perhaps a more important factor was that he was never in the stream of English Catholic life. As a boy, at least until he was received into the Church at fourteen years of age, he knew nothing of it; his next four years of hard study at Old Hall and afterwards his living in London whilst reading for his degrees would be the only period in which he came at all into contact with Catholic life in England. For fifty-eight years he lived out of England and even in his holidays he did not mingle in ecclesiastical circles, and so had little opportunity of coming to know the trend of things Catholic in England. He was not in the current of English ways and their intimacies and so it is easy to see that he was a stranger to the views and assumptions of people at home. Their ideas and his, without actually clashing, were not in tune and by some he was found not *simpatico*. He was never in real touch with English affairs except as an outsider. It is true, of course, that he acted as Agent for the English Bishops for many years, but this did not make him intimate with these affairs and their implications and reactions. He was too detached from them, partly of necessity and partly from a natural disinclination to interfere with what was not his particular work in life—a narrow view of things undoubtedly, and one which begot misunderstandings. The sad consequence was that this dearest, most loveable and warm-hearted of men was regarded as cold and stand-off. A chance remark of Cardinal Vaughan's that the Rector's favourite dish was "cold shoulder" reflected a not uncommon opinion. This apparent aloofness, the fruit of a natural reserve and shyness and want of intimacy with Catholic affairs in England, was accentu-

ated by his opinion of the position of the College as a Papal College. He held that he was responsible solely to the Holy Father and his representative, the Cardinal Protector of the College, and was completely independent of Bishops in England as to the conduct of the House, and perhaps resentful of any suggestion of change in the system of studies or the training of their students. This was naturally a severe trial to Bishops who had entrusted their students to his care for six years and did not know the details of their lives nor of their progress in their work. " Reports " of their students were few, and sketchy when made. This and other small points of privilege, such as obtaining letters dimissorial from the Cardinal Protector instead of from their own Bishops, did not ease matters and tended to estrangement. But this tenacious hold of Papal privilege was not reserved only for Bishops. A Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda once wrote to say that he proposed to make a Visitation of the College. The Rector wrote at once saying that he would be most welcome to the hospitality of the House but that he could not hold a Visitation without the permission of the Protector. The matter was dropped.

Some of the Bishops at home would have preferred a greater variety in the studies by way of preparation for the Mission, but the Rector was adamant in his opinion that the course of studies at the Gregorian University was the true Roman course and he would have no other—and there was much to be said for this opinion, as the course was heavily laden and allowed no time for extra subjects of study. He held stoutly that if a man was to take advantage of the University lectures he had no time for other work.

Then again some opinions were ventilated that there was not sufficient training in ascetics either by way of conferences and sermons or by intimate counsel with an experienced spiritual guide. There was much undoubtedly to be said for this criticism and it was expressed aloud by the students themselves. But with his usual diffidence in making any new venture the Rector did nothing. This defect the Holy See has now remedied by appointing a Spiritual Father whose sole work consists in the spiritual guidance of the students.

Dr. Giles's view would probably have been that the

Venerabile was not a seminary in the accepted sense of the word, but a College of a University where the students should be treated as responsible men and where self-reliance and formation of character were acquired in the hard school of self-training. The usual series of spiritual exercises was, of course, rigorously insisted on and followed out in the greatest exactitude; Meditation, Mass, Rosary, Spiritual Reading, Examination of conscience, and vocal prayers; and any neglect of these duties was regarded by the Rector as a very serious offence indeed. He himself never missed any of these duties, and even in extreme old age and weakness and when he had to be bodily supported he would still attend them. But beyond this there was nothing in the way of training, at least in the years 1888-1894 during which I was a student under him. For the rest we were left to ourselves and our confessor. It can be very well argued that to take such risks of failure in young men was a big price to pay for the acquisition of self-reliance and of a solid piety that would stand the shocks and dangers and loneliness of a priest's life at home. So far as argument goes his system can be riddled by arguments and by the post-Tridentine tradition of training the clergy. It savoured somewhat, but very little, of the mediæval system which the Council of Trent had altogether changed. But although theoretically incorrect his system worked, which is again illogical and English. But yet a system which in a small house of an average of less than eighteen men could produce such men as Bishop Allen, Dr. William Barry, Mgr. Parkinson, Archbishop McIntyre, Dr. Kolbe, Archbishop Whiteside, Bishop Cowgill, Bishop Burton, Archbishop Hinsley, Bishop Keatinge, and Dr. Francis Lloyd of Oscott cannot at least be dubbed a failure. Whether the system would have worked with larger numbers is open to argument, but whatever can be said in its favour the Holy See has changed it. *Roma locuta est* and that is sufficient.

Another point not unallied to the above was that both he and his predecessor never bothered about a code of rules. Whenever a new student did ask about rules he was told to do as the others did and not to worry about a detailed code of rules. This would seem to be the very antithesis of training and discipline, but again it worked, at all events during the period I was in the House, and I cannot speak of any other time. The

minute observance of duties, especially in the absence of the Superiors, was very marked, and was remarked favourably upon by strangers, as we were informed by our confessor, Fr. Chierici, C.SS.R.

This reliance on tradition was deep down in Dr. Giles's character, and one of his reasons for any thing being allowed or otherwise was whether it had been done before. "*Cosi faceva nonno*" was the retort of the vine dressers at Monte Porzio when more modern methods of viticulture were being impressed upon them, and it met with hearty approval from the Rector.

He trusted his students and relied on their conducting themselves as responsible men and not as children. When, however, he did find fault there was no doubt of the strength and determination behind his words. There was one such incident at Monte Porzio in the holidays of 1891 when some men had been smoking in the woods. He said, in public, that if he found anyone smoking it would mean a passport for England. And he meant it. He had an old-fashioned prejudice against tobacco. During the epidemic of influenza in 1895 the senior student went to ask the Rector for permission to smoke as a preventive against the disease. The answer was a most decided refusal. "No, the remedy is worse than the disease and I will not allow it." The student persisted in the presentation of his case, bringing forward weighty reasons for it to which, to his surprise, the Rector did not reply. He looked up and found him sound asleep.

Loyalty to his principles, and obstinacy in that loyalty, was one of his loveable traits; especially was it so in his loyalty to the Holy See. He was a "Pope's man," and there could be no possibility of faltering in that loyalty. The Pope had been dispossessed of his own and Dr. Giles would hear nothing good of his dispossessors. He invariably referred to the Italian Government as "these Piedmontese," and this was twenty years after the taking of Rome. Even the hats worn by the students were the old "tricorni" of Papal days and he would not allow the use of the flat round-brimmed hats that became the vogue after 1870. The use of the old-fashioned hat still survives in the Venerabile to the joy of those who remember old Rome.

He was certainly a man that needed a great deal of

knowing. His humility and reticence were so great that many who knew him fairly intimately regarded him as a man of no great parts or accomplishments; whereas he was a first-rate classical scholar and he wrote English of a wonderful clarity; he was, too, a water-colour painter of merit, and one of the joys of Feast Days was to prevail on him to bring his many sketches to the "Playroom" and to show us what Rome and the Campagna and the hill villages of the Volscians and the Hernicans were like in the old Papal days.

He did not shine in public as he suffered from a great hesitancy in speech, caused partly by his shyness and partly by his fastidiousness in the choice of the right word. But in contrast with this was his very beautiful reading, and those who have heard him read will never forget his rich clear voice and perfect enunciation as he read each day Rodriguez or other spiritual book.

He was in reality the most loveable of men: never was heard from him an unkind word and he had an inexhaustible charity for the poor. This charity was undoubtedly indiscriminate: he gave to all who asked him for alms. How he did it was a mystery, for no matter how many beggars accosted him he was always able to find *soldi* for them. Besides the beggars he had a long list of pensioners who came on Saturday mornings when all the students were at the Schools. Of course, in such undiscerning charity he was often victimized but that worried him not at all. He would rather be victimized times out of number than miss a single case of real want. "If I am swindled," he said to a critic, "that is their responsibility, if I miss a good case it's mine." It was a simple rule, but he was a simple soul as the saints are simple. He was straight in his dealings with all because his thoughts were nothing but straight and he would not suspect another of crookedness even after he had experience of it.

In his charity he was very sensitive in any matter which would show any distinction between students who had private means and those who had not. He would not allow any difference or variation in dress or clothing, nor would he allow men with means to go on holidays by themselves either in Italy or elsewhere. In compensation for this he arranged for *gite*—excursions, both short and long; but he insisted on paying all the

expenses. I well remember in 1893, I was treasurer of the party, and when I paid over the balance on our return he said: "you cannot have had much of a good time."

Fuss of any kind he abhorred. When, on St. George's Day in 1893, the Fort of San Paolo blew up, the Chapel rocked literally as in an earthquake, and the dust and cobwebs of thirty years came floating on to the altar where the Rector was finishing Mass; he turned to me, who was taking shelter under an arch close by, and said, in the most matter-of-fact voice: "Go and tell Sor Angelo to clear up this mess," and quietly finished Mass.

Of his interior life who shall speak? If, however, we are to judge by the charity that pervaded his whole life and outlook on life, then he must have been very near to the Heart of God. So great was his determination in his last days not to give way to bodily weakness, and so great his fear of giving example of slackness to the students in attendance at the public duties, that he refused to be absent from them although he had to be supported lest he should fall. All we who saw a little behind the veil of his little showing knew him as a very gentle, perfect and winning soul who bound us to himself with unbreaking bonds of personal devotion and affection, and his memory and his great example will ever be a source of inspiration to act not unworthily of him.

ONE MORE WORD FOR THE SEA-APOSTOLATE

By the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.

IT appears that there are over one million, five hundred thousand seafarers in the world. It is reckoned that of these, *eight hundred thousand* are Catholic.

Much work is done on behalf of seamen; but recently it could be affirmed that whereas more than fifty per cent. of the men were Catholics, less than twenty-five per cent. of the work was being done *by* Catholics. We cannot wonder that Cardinal Van Rossum, whose devotion to sea-work is well known, wrote in 1929: "In this work . . . Catholics are behind. . . . We wish that they should double their efforts in the interests of Catholic seafarers who have been hitherto sadly neglected." This statement followed on others, made in 1926 and 1928.

Undoubtedly His Eminence must have been cheered by the almost miraculous progress of Catholic sea-work during, say, the last five years: but after two more sea-voyages I find myself filled with so much conviction and sincere desire as to this subject that there is "in my heart as it were a burning fire shut up within my bones," and if Jeremias said: "I am weary with forbearing, and I cannot," I shall plead for a tiny fraction of the forgiveness accorded to him, and ask to be allowed once more to return to the subject.

It would be very easy in this paper to give many statistics, lists of institutes, names of zealous "Sea-Apostles"; but I would prefer to say something about methods and motives, and, to be further forgiven if I illustrate them by small incidents such as may make what follows seem too egotistic. I honestly cannot help it—after all, "what we know, that speak we; and what we have seen, to that bear we witness." Indeed, while I could never have been very stirred myself by abstract considerations about our duty towards Catholic seamen, it is, precisely, small personal experiences such as I quote that have created in me a paramount conviction, and would to

God I could in any way communicate it. But, first, it is right to set down a line or two about the nature of the Sea-Apostolate, as it is called.

The " Apostleship of the Sea " is rather like the name " University." Foreigners visiting Oxford expect to find a " University " enclosed in walls. One indicates various colleges, and says: " The collectivity of these is the ' University '; yet, the University as such has its own function—even, its own finance." Little by little they assimilate this. Till fairly recently, a score of different organizations did, and indeed do, work among Catholic seamen: the Oeuvre des Gens de Mer; the Kolping Society; the S.V.P.; Knights of Columbus; Knights of the Holy Cross—very many more. But they worked individualistically; juxtaposed at best; in no organic union. Hence no one really knew what was going on: you had to keep immense quantities of disparate printed material; expense was a score of times multiplied; inter-communication was impossible; there was no one name or badge or periodical or anything else that seamen could recognize. The first step towards organization of all these dissipated forces was taken by the " Apostleship of the Sea," whose headquarters were at Glasgow. Although the world-over inter-connection is not yet perfected, it tends to be so, and " Apostleship of the Sea " is now a covering name, and not a particularist title. I say this (to be quite frank) lest anyone should imagine that the organization that once worked from Glasgow and is now hospitalized by the S.V.P. headquarters in London, 66, Victoria Street, S.W.1, aims, or ever has aimed, at " buying up " other organizations. If every organization now at work, did twice what it is doing, we should not be within measurable distance of what needs to be done. Not one effort can be spared. All that is asked is, that they be co-ordinated. I think that everyone sees this now. *One* set of men needs helping: but it is one set (i) existing in *all* parts of the world, and (ii) composed of men of *every* nationality. Londoners will be in Shanghai or Marseilles; Neapolitans and Goans will be in Liverpool. We need then a world-wide *entente*, made concrete in one name, one badge, one (very general) method; and one headquarters (which might be anywhere convenient —Barcelona, Buenos Aires, for all I care, if it but be

the best place), where information can be pooled, and whence it can be distributed.

Let me begin with the simplest—a priest on board ship. When I went to New Zealand, I found afterwards that a young fireman had run to all his Catholic mates, saying: "We've got a priest on board! *I recognized the wee badge!*" Picture his disappointment, had I not looked them up! I know of one ship that went to the Chicago congress. It had I know not how many priests and prelates on board—about fifty-six, I think. The crew was so proud of them, for much of it was Catholic. And eagerly looking forward. . . . But it so happened that not one of them all addressed one word to any of that crew. The disappointment was bitter. When pursers have said to me: "No doubt you will want the first-class saloon for your service?" I have always answered: "I don't mind what the place is. I want the people. I want the first-class passengers; but, if I can have one set only, I prefer the third. And to the third, I prefer the stokers." Why? Because you must begin with the *most* helpless; the most forgotten; the least likely to prove (people think!) responsive. But responsive they are. On that New Zealand boat, we had Mass at 3.50; because, being an oil-ship, men could come off watch a little before 4, if they were on from 12—4; and go down to watch a little late, if they were on from 4—8. Now you could not ask men to be in an engine-room or stoke-hole till 8, without drinking; moreover, at 8, publicity would have been too great for their Mass. But all the Catholics made their "duties," some, with tears of joy, having thought (one young Irishman of nineteen told me) that they'd "never get there again." Moreover, it lasts. That is three years ago: but they still write. One, in his own name; one, in that of several, for *they* cannot write. (Actually, since I wrote the MS. of this, he has come to England from Belfast, and brought a friend to see me.) But so long as they were together, they said a nightly Hail Mary for me. Is not that a treasure beyond reckoning? But suppose one hadn't gone? Think of the loss to the priest.

Now, take the Sacraments. I suppose I can generalize, without offence, and say that on an average (allowing for ages varying from forty to seventeen) men seem to

have been " away " for four years. Coming home this time, I had three first Communions—seamen, aged nineteen, twenty-five and thirty-two. Now why? First, the appalling homes of many of them. (Here is a sentence, textually accurate: A seafaring lad called on me recently in London. " I'm disgusted with meself. Disgusted. Kicked me dad and stove two of his ribs in. Kicking me dad! Ne' done no such thing before. Bashing his face in, *o' course, that's only natural. . . .*") Second, the all-but impossibility of getting to Communion when in port. They are often not allowed on shore till afternoon. But, they argue (at best), If I can't get to Communion, what's the use of confession? Again, if a lad has joined young and innocent, the moment comes when he is terrified of confession even when at home on leave. Again, the frightful force of convention. Presumably priests know of the " blue " cinemas to be found in perhaps most large ports. They are, of course, beyond words. Yet there is a convention to go to them once, at any rate. On one trip, a passenger, I heard, was making up a party, and intending to take a most innocent young Irishman (not a member of the crew exactly). I asked the boy if he really wanted to go? He said he'd been driven so desperate by chaff that he'd better go and get it over. As a matter of fact, I concocted a gin-party on board, and *no one* so much as went on shore. The passenger stewed solitary in his disgusting juice. Again, force of circumstances. After weeks of exhausting work (not that I propose to sentimentalize about seamen's work: I think there are worse kinds), of thoroughly broken-up sleep, food that you have lost your appetite to eat, complete and continuous publicity, the talk that you may expect, well, " shore " comes. Can you *not* go? Can you go alone? Can you *not* seek a drink or two? An overwhelming mass-suggestion does the rest. Then, at first, despair; then, gradually, *taking it all for granted.* And, last of all, lack of instruction. Many men, clear that they should observe " my marriage vows," are quite as clear that there can't be anything wrong in unmarried men acting thus and thus—just as continually on shore, one finds that *engagement* is believed to be the substantial thing; marriage, *i.e.*, in church or registry-office exists to legitimatize the offspring. Anyhow, this uninstruction is tragic. Yet half

of them are passionately interested in religion. Only the Bolshevik hates the Church. Others may even say: "Of course, we all know the Roman Catholic religion is the old one, and it ought to know what's what." So, marvellous opportunities for instruction, both of Catholics and of others. On my first descent to one stoke-hole, an unknown man said to me: "What in hell are you doing here?" I said: "Meeting you, apparently." He said: "If religion's not free on this ship, what is?" I said I was looking for Catholics, and was he one? He said: "No, *but I want to be!*" And he did. By a marvellous permission, he was allowed to come nightly for an hour and half's instruction in my cabin. I received him in Cape Town. Precipitate? It has not proved so. He wrote steadily; made his first Communion on his own in New Zealand and several confessions; withstood the continuous attack, during his return, made against the Church by two bad Liverpool-Irish Catholics, and since my return has brought two brothers to be instructed, has made a retreat, and caused a small nephew to be baptized. His retort had been: "I ain't got no arguments; but, *see these fists?*" Such men are robust in act as well as talk! (When I remarked to a trimmer, on our way home, on Stromboli in eruption, he said: "Last night some scalding water fell on me hand. Stromboli nothing! You should have heard *me!*") So much more could be said: but here I beg two things. First, that all priests who travel should make use of their incomparable opportunity—"But, I'm out for a *holiday!*" But *is* not that a holiday? Is any "recreation" comparable to the joy thus derived? When Our Lord had talked with the Samaritaness, He would not eat. He no more needed to. He had had His food! And a baser motive—If we *do* not do it, we accentuate the terribly increasing idea that priests belong to "class." The saloon; the deck-games; Mass (as a German paper puts it) a "passenger-luxury." We have already to fear foreign anti-clericalism in England—religion is "bourgeois"—"But all that requires special gifts. I *could* not talk to such men." But what are "such" men? Just *men!* Am I conscious of "class" when I meet them? No more than, from the outset, I was conscious of colour when talking to a Zulu or

Matabele. And again; at least on board, do I find more immorality among them than among first-class passengers? I should think, a good deal less. Do I find fewer ideas? *Many more.* Less hospitality? A passenger *may* offer me a cocktail, always expecting one in return. A stoker would *always* offer me tea (and, even, his fried fish); and only with infinite tact will you get him privately to accept, say, two shillings " for the children " —" It remains, I *couldn't!*" " Omnia possum in eo. . . ." Whose knees do not turn to water, before " going down " for the first time, each voyage? Who doesn't feel sea-sick, just before the first self-introduction? Who is not hopelessly tongue-tied half the time and at a loss? Loathe it, as much as he comes to love it? But who should rely on " gifts " other than those of the Holy Ghost, in such circumstances? If there is a job that plenty of people can and do perform, for which we have no " gift," *e.g.*, giving a retreat to children, no need to thrust ourselves into it! But if there is a thing that *must* be done, and we are the only priest present to do it, and feel we cannot, is not that the very hour for relying on: " In *that* hour it shall be *given* you what to speak "? If to the end you feel you have but made a fool of yourself, what of it? The sheer sacrifice will have earned souls; moreover, in their way the men will have appreciated the effort. " But there is no *obligation* about it! Where would one stop, if one felt scruples about such things?" Well, *are* they scruples? Does not the enormous extension of faculties in regard of seafaring priests prove that the Church expects one to make great and varied use of a voyage? And I am sure that the results are so disproportionate to the effort, you may say so miraculously generous—after feeling that every door is padlocked, you find that there *are* no doors and simply walk straight through—that you have to conclude that God wills the work and blesses it. The other point is simple—we ought to get it recognized that a travelling priest is automatically *chaplain* to the men, who should, therefore, be allowed to visit him as they may the doctor. Else, privacy is almost impossible. I heard my last two confessions, one on a perpendicular iron ladder going down to the hold; the other in a coal bunker where you could hardly see the electric light for dust. I have left no room for

discussing (i) ship-visiting, and can but say that it is bitterly humiliating to have Wesleyans, Salvationists, etc., etc., coming on board to visit the men (they cut no ice, but they *come*), but *not* Catholics; or (ii), port-chaplains and port-hostels. Again, humiliating if hardly ever do men know of the Catholic hostel, if any, and how few these are, how poor, how invisible—often, how dull! Australian Sea-work has recently been magnificently centralized and organized; but, N.B., at Sydney, where the Institute is large and visible, and visiting regular, during a recent "quarter" 674 men attended Mass on shore, with 145 Communions, out of 984 Catholics visited, as contrasted with 30 at Mass, and 14 Communions, out of 746 visited, in a city where the Institute is distant; and, in fact, the average for other Australian and New Zealand ports is 12 Communions. Do our towns, that primarily exist because of their port, think of that port as a primary charge upon their Catholic zeal? I fear, not yet. But may I, in this paper, have made one point, at anyrate—*work possible to travelling priests*—not unsuited to this Review.

HOMILETICS

By the Rev. Leonard Geddes, S.J.,
of Heythrop College.

The Feast of the Holy Name.

Epistle. (Acts iv. 8-12.)

The name of a person much loved can be itself loved. It is so intimately associated with the person that it can excite the very emotions connected with him. And if this is the case with us, it must have been very much more so with the Hebrews. Among us names either have no significance of themselves, or have lost any significance they once had. Among the Hebrews the names given were full of meaning, and were chosen, after much thought and consultation, to express some characteristic, actual or hoped for, of the persons receiving them. Moreover, the relation between the name and its owner was regarded as the very closest of associations, amounting almost to identity. "To be called" was "to be": "He shall be called the Son of God"; "Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High." Hence we can understand the awe in which the sacred name of God was held, awe such that it might not even be uttered except by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement.

The name of Our Lord was chosen by God Himself with infinite fittingness: Jesus, Jehovah-is-Salvation. Many magnificent names had been given to Him through the prophets; for example: "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the World to come, the Prince of Peace" (Is. ix. 6). The one chosen was even more fitting than these. On the one hand, it is the human name of one of our own stock, one whom we know, who is, even as man, the object of our deepest loyalty and love; the name by which His Mother called Him, which breathes the very fragrance of His wonderful humanity. On the other, it expresses the deepest truths of His nature and office: Jehovah-is-Salvation: God of God, become Man for the redemption of men.

What to-day's Epistle puts prominently before us is the power of the Name, and so of the Person who bears it; and the claim of Name and Person to our trust. Peter and John, invoking the name of Jesus, had healed the man at the Beautiful Gate of the temple; and thereafter Peter had addressed the crowd, overwhelmed by this marvel, on the Divinity and Messiahship of Jesus: "The author of life you killed," he tells them. For all this the Apostles are brought to book before the ecclesiastical princes of Israel, and asked: "By what power, or by what name, have you done this?" In the Epistle we have St. Peter's answer: "It is by the name of Jesus of Nazareth, Whom you

crucified, Whom God hath raised from the dead, even by Him this man standeth here before you whole." The miracle is a dramatic display of the power of that Name and of that Person. They can see with their own eyes what, in the visible order, that name can do.

But a miracle, to use St. John's invariable word, is a " sign " ; it is an evidence in the visible and natural order—evidence, that is, that our senses can perceive—of truth in the invisible and supernatural order. In this case the truth so witnessed to is the ever present saving power of the Word of God Incarnate; power that all who with love and trust call upon His name can put into operation. This St. Peter goes on to indicate : " There is no other name under Heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." It is only through the satisfaction made by Jesus that we can obtain remission of our sins; only through His merits that we can obtain the treasure of supernatural life and do anything at all to merit eternal salvation. To win these blessings for us He took a human nature and was known by a human name. It is that name and those merits which are invoked by the Church in all her prayers to the Triune God : " Through Jesus Christ Our Lord." He is " the one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." He is our one source of hope, but a source of abundant hope.

The Church, by celebrating this feast, wishes to put these thoughts vividly before us, and, by making us think of that name and of all that it stands for, to quicken our loyalty and love towards Him Who bears it. She wants us more and more to think of Him, not as some shadowy figure out of the past, but as a living Person with Whom we are familiar, Whom we call by a loved name, in Whose hands we can confidently place the small things of time and the great things of eternity.

First Sunday after Epiphany, Feast of the Holy Family.

Gospel. (Luke ii. 42-52.)

The Gospel for the Feast is the same as the Gospel for the Sunday. It might at first sight appear strange that a passage is chosen, describing, not the normal characteristics of that life at Nazareth, but the one recorded event of those years which is out of key with their usual character. The reason is, of course, that there is no passage in the Gospel which can be said to describe the life in that home, while to-day's Gospel gives an idea of what that life normally was from the grief and surprise which the incident narrated caused.

The family is the God-given school of virtue : of obedience, of humility, of charity and self-sacrifice, of industry, of gentleness. Such it was at Nazareth. All the virtues that can lend such grace to family life there had their perfect expression. Not, indeed, that Our Lord had any need to learn virtue in this or in any other school. He was holy with the uncreated

holiness of the Godhead. But the Eternal Word Himself, by electing to be born a human child and become a member of a human family, took upon Himself the obligation of practising those virtues which family life demands and teaches. There were the same obligations on the members of that family as upon the members of any family to-day. It is possible to lay too much stress on the fact that this or that in the life of Our Lord was done for example. Take obedience, for instance. Our Lord did not obey merely as an act of grace, or to point the way for us. He was in very truth subject to Mary and Joseph. In that household the order of authority was the opposite to the order of dignity: Joseph, Mary, Jesus. To God alone belongs all authority, because He is by inalienable right supreme Lord and Master; and from Him all authority descends. To some by natural law or by positive institution He has delegated His right to command: to fathers of families for instance, to the Pastors of His Church, to those who lawfully receive authority from these. So in that family Joseph was by divine right master, and the greatest of the great, even Jesus Himself as man, and Mary the Mother of God, were subject to him. The very principle of obedience, even in the family, is being lost sight of to-day. The Word of God Incarnate did not find it beneath His dignity to be bound to obey His own creature. So in that family true and perfect order prevailed.

And there was no less perfect practice of the other virtues which, when they flourish, make the Christian family such a beautiful thing. That there be mutual respect in word and manner does not go without saying in a family; but what a difference it can make, and what a grace it must have lent to that home. In fact, they must all have realized that there was no home like their home; and if ever a member of it went away, with what joy he must have returned. It is impossible to conceive there any of the things that mar the harmony of a home: any self-seeking, any playing for their own hands, any such thing as a harsh or contemptuous word, any jealousy, or unwillingness to recognize success or merit. There may have been contention, but it could only have been through each trying to yield to the others what all could not have, to be first in rendering service or anticipating needs. That home was instinct with generosity, with self-sacrifice, with sympathy for success no less than for sorrow, with loyalty and love.

There was, apparently, just one break in that peaceful routine; and it is told in the Gospel just because it was such an exceptional event. On the occasion of the visit to Jerusalem Our Lord did two unprecedented things: He showed independence and He caused them pain. God, Who ordinarily governs through His delegates, can, if He sees fit, take the administration into His own hands. He does so when He gives son or daughter a divine call to follow Christ in the priesthood or religion. On this occasion Our Lord must have received a direct command from His Father to manifest Himself in Jerusalem, and to

show Mary and Joseph that even their rights over Him were subject to higher authority. The very surprise and sorrow that this caused show how alien it was from His usual way of acting. It brings into higher relief His normal life of obedience and tender thought for them.

The family is the school of virtue. The things that came easily to the members of the household of Nazareth have to be learned by us through patient and sustained effort. But the life there lived is not meant merely to be admired; it shows the practical ideal for us to work towards. All that live in families, whether in the capacity of rulers or ruled, should have an ambition to realize this ideal in their own homes. It is an exacting ideal; but it is to give men, women, and children an opportunity of practising these virtues and of growing in them that God has ordained the existence of families and placed men in them.

Second Sunday after Epiphany.

Epistle. (Romans xii. 6-16.)

The passage read in to-day's Epistle becomes intelligible only in its context. The chapter from which it is taken is one of those in which St. Paul treats at some length of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. The words immediately preceding are: "For as in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, everyone members one of another. And having different gifts . . ." (then follows our Epistle). Those gifts are, as it were, the various functions of the different members—limbs and organs—of that body.

St. Paul has little to say of what we may call the institutional side of the Church: of her hierarchical order of rulers and ruled, teachers and taught; but he has a great deal to say of her hidden, purely supernatural, side: of what she really is in truth rather than what she externally shows herself to be. For St. Paul she is a living body; not a mere collection of individuals united by common purpose and common organization, but an organic unity living with one life. All the members, organs, parts of this body are individual men and women who have been incorporated into it. But the incorporation is a vital one, analogous to that by which new matter is assimilated into the human body, not a mere aggregation.

Moreover, the very being of that body centres in a mysterious way round Christ Our Lord. St. Paul calls it sometimes "the Body of Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 27), or "one body in Christ" (Rom. xii. 5), but in 1 Cor. xii. 12 he calls it simply "Christ": "As the body is one and hath many members, . . . so also is Christ." And yet Christ appears also as the head, the principal member: "(God) hath made him head over all the Church, which is his body" (Eph. i. 22-23). So with the Apostle we distinguish two "Christs": the natural Christ who was born

of Mary, lived on earth, and redeemed us; and the " Mystical " Christ, that body of which the natural Christ is the head, and we by vital incorporation are all members.

So the Church is the completion of Christ (Eph. i. 23). He grows with its growth—by the incorporation of new members and by the supernatural growth of those already incorporated. The term of this growth will be the " adult stature " of Christ (Eph. iv. 11-13).

It is this supernatural growth which is the whole object of the machinery of the Church. For St. Paul the main function of the head in the human body is to be the source of life for the whole body. Life flows from it through all " joints and arteries " to the individual members. So in the " Mystical Body " all life flows into the members from the Head, Christ. The Hierarchy of the Church, with its functions of teaching, ruling, and above all sacramental ministration is the system of channnels communicating that life. Through the divine life so communicated from the Head the members " grow a divine growth " (Col. ii. 19).

This, then is the Church, into which, by the uncovenanted mercy of God, we have been individually admitted. It is because she is all this that she is the " one ark of salvation for all." Here, too, we see the explanation of her divine prerogatives. Christ is " incorporate " in her: this body is the vehicle of His activity now as His mortal body was the vehicle of His activity when He was upon earth Incarnate. She teaches infallibly: Christ is teaching in her—as it were through her mouth. She has, in the Sacraments, the power of conferring inward sanctification by external acts: again it is Christ Who says through her: " Go in peace; thy sins are forgiven thee," " Receive ye the Holy Ghost." If we regard the Church merely as a divinely instituted society (which, indeed, she is), we are regarding rather her outward aspect than her inward, vital reality.

As in the body as a whole so in the individual members that life is the principle of activity. The " gifts " of which St. Paul speaks in to-day's Epistle are the fruits of that activity. They are the manifestations of supernatural life to which the Holy Spirit, the soul of the Mystical Body, energizes the individual members of that body. They cover a wide field, from prophecy to human sympathy (" Rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep "). All are not given to everyone. But the exercise of those that are divinely put within our power—i.e., the performance of all supernatural acts—is the use we make of that hidden life, the means by which we grow in it, and so our one way of making ourselves for eternity.

It is also the way in which we serve Christ in His members. It may be noticed that in general the " gifts " have a reference to helpfulness towards others; but it is towards them as towards those whom Christ has incorporated, or would incorporate in

Himself. Here we have the highest ideal of service put before us. In serving our fellow-men we are serving Christ Himself. As to Him we can "minister, teach, love without dissimulation, contribute to necessities, rejoice with them rejoice. . . ." What would we like to do for Christ if we could meet Him on earth and in need? We can do it to Him now in doing it to those whom He has made one with Himself.

Septuagesima Sunday.

Gospel. (Matthew xx. 1-16.) *The Labourers in the Vineyard.*

This parable is difficult of interpretation, and has been taken in various senses both by the Fathers and by modern commentators. The more usual view now seems to be that the different hours at which the men in the story are called are the different periods of life at which we may answer the call of God and turn to His service. In that case the point is that, however late in life one is converted to God, still the whole of the reward can be gained, while early conversion is not necessarily an earnest of ultimate success: "For the last shall be first and the first last."

According to the older interpretation, going back to St. Irenaeus in the second century, the hours of the day signify periods in the history of the world. The vineyard is the theocratic kingdom upon earth. In the old dispensation this was the Synagogue, in the new it is the Church. "For the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel" (Isaias v. 7). This seems too the natural way of understanding the parable, considering the place it occupies in St. Matthew's Gospel. In the two following chapters are the parables of the two sons, the wicked husbandmen, and the marriage feast. All of these were warnings to the Jews, and were given by Our Lord towards the end of His life, when other means of winning the nation, particularly its ruling classes, had failed. The point of them all is that the Messianic Kingdom is no particular appanage of the Jewish people; that the Jews may even lose their position in it entirely, and find themselves supplanted by the Gentiles. "Therefore, I say, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43). If the parable is taken as one of this class, i.e., as having a special reference to the Jews' loss of privilege as possessors of the Kingdom of God, it is further explained why it is given only by St. Matthew. He was writing for the Jews to whom it directly referred; St. Mark and St. Luke omit it as having no special interest for the Gentile converts for whom they were writing.

In this case the eleventh hour is Messianic times, the Christian era. "Little children, it is the last hour" (1 John ii. 18). The earlier hours are the times of the old Theocracy. The nations, last called, will receive the same reward for their service

of God in His vineyard as the Jews who have laboured in it from the earliest times. So understood this parable fits naturally into this part of St. Matthew's Gospel.

But though meant primarily for the Jews it is still full of meaning for us. In the first place, there is the fact that it is purely through an act of God's mercy unmerited by us (the "call" of the husbandman, Christ) that we are in the Church at all, and have placed within our grasp all the means she offers of gaining the eternal reward. Then again, the reward itself, the "penny" of the parable—the recognized day's wage paid to those who had laboured for only one hour out of the twelve—is out of proportion to anything we could merit by our own labours. It is moreover a gratuitous gift, in that the beatific vision and the supernatural elevation that makes it possible have been won for us by the sacrifice of the Son of God freely offered for us: "Cannot I do what I like with *my own*?" Man had no claim at all of his own that such a destiny should be put within his grasp. And, lastly, there is the nature of the reward. In itself it is equal for all—again the "penny" of the parable. It consists in the possession of God by knowledge and love of Him seen face to face, and that for all eternity. He is perfection itself, beauty itself; all that can delight the mind or thrill the heart here on earth can do so only because it is some shadowing forth of this fullness of truth and beauty. He who possesses God in this way possesses everything. Nothing greater could be given, and all this is given to the least of those who gain the reward of Heaven. But that does not mean that the happiness of our eternal reward will be equal for all. We shall have different capacities for knowledge and love according to our different degrees of merit. The beatific vision is the act to which the whole of the supernatural life is ordered. The more we gain of that life now by all our efforts of virtue here on earth, the greater will be our joy for eternity in the fuller knowledge and love of God, the fullness of truth and beauty, of which we shall thereby become capable. Every minute of life is a glorious opportunity. In every one of them we can be doing something to make ourselves for the true and permanent life that is to come. We shall be wise not to waste one of them.

Sexagesima Sunday.

Gospel. (Luke viii. 4-15.) *The Sower.*

As given in St. Luke this parable is isolated, but in St. Matthew (c. xiii.) and St. Mark (c. iv.) it forms one of a set of parables in which are indicated various aspects of the theocratic kingdom upon earth which Our Lord had come to found. There was a universal expectation at the time of the coming of the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom, and Our Lord had fanned that expectation. He had toured the country announcing "the good news of the Kingdom" (Matt. iv. 23).

He did not in set terms describe its nature—that it was to be spiritual, non-national, other-worldly. His hearers were not ready for that. They expected the Kingdom to be the temporal glorification of Israel. A clear announcement would merely have aroused distrust of Him and of His message. It would have frustrated His work at the very outset. But in the parables He gave hints which would convey a meaning to those who had spiritual insight, and would prepare the minds of men in general for the clearer announcement that was to come later. These hints He made explicit for the Apostles whom He was training: "To you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God."

In to-day's Gospel what He hints at is that in the Kingdom the interior element is to be of dominant importance. No mere aggregation could give the blessings of the Kingdom, though the Jews expected to enjoy them on the sole title of being children of Abraham. The extent to which men should be of the Kingdom, and so participate in her benefits, would depend on the way in which they received "the word of the Kingdom" (Matthew xiii. 18), the "seed" of the parable. Our Lord tells in veiled language—and afterwards explains clearly to the Apostles—how the word can become fruitless, and so membership of the Kingdom of no avail. By the "word of the Kingdom" must be meant the Beatitudes and the great spiritual principles which had been the subject of Our Lord's discourses during His preaching tour. (See Matthew v. and vi.) For membership of the Kingdom to be effective that "seed" must germinate and fructify into life and action. Our Lord indicates the obstacles to that vital efficacy of the word: sheer inability to receive it, instability of character, absorption in material interests.

For us the nature of the Kingdom needs no explanation. We know, too, what it means to be of the Church as well as in the Church. We know that Christian principles must dominate life if our baptism, by which we have been aggregated to the Church, is to become also our passport to eternal life. These principles must be possessed and translated into action. But to this there are still the same obstacles as when Our Lord spoke. As regards the first, the seed falling where it had no chance of taking root, that is a very actual problem to-day. We hear much of the leakage among the young, and with cause. A vast percentage of Catholic children after they leave school simply desert the Church. The word of the Kingdom means nothing to them. They hear it at school, but the seed takes no root. How can this tremendous evil, working the harm it does in individual lives and in the fortunes of the Church, be countered? The fault seems to lie in the families. Children from their earliest years should be taught about Our Lord, and taught to revere and love all that belongs to Him. Unless this is done from the beginning what is learnt at school becomes merely a lesson, and an unpalatable lesson at that. Let all fathers and mothers of the

young realize the responsibility that lies upon them, to prepare the soil to receive the seed of Catholic teaching.

Instability of character, the second obstacle to the development and fructification of the seed is, we may be inclined to say, not our own fault. But one of the main purposes of our moral life is the combating of inherent weakness. Our every act has its effect on our characters. We are training ourselves day by day. Whenever we act on principle we are not merely being virtuous for the moment, but we are training ourselves for the future; when we let ourselves follow the line of least resistance, we are laying up for ourselves an evil heritage in the weakness we are accentuating. This matter of the training and strengthening of character is not one that concerns our early years only. It is an object of lifelong endeavour.

Last, there is the class of those in whom the tender plant of the faith is choked by alien growths. That is an ever pressing danger for all of us. Religion needs to be kept living and active; otherwise more and more it fades from the mind. "Our citizenship is in Heaven," but our interests tend to cling to earth. The unseen world becomes unreal and the visible world seems to be the whole of reality. The one thing that keeps us in touch with the unseen world is prayer. We cannot escape contact with this world; we cannot avoid having duties and interests other than those which are directly religious. But the man who prays will never allow these to fill the whole of his horizon; he will never lose the treasure he has received in the gift of faith.

L. W. G.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. LITURGY.

By the Right Rev. Mgr. Canon Myers, M.A.

It would be difficult to imagine a more forbidding volume than the six hundred and fifty-four large octavo pages of *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Age* (VII^e-X^e siècle) : *I Les Manuscrits,* recently published by Monsieur l'Abbé Michel Andrieu, Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie catholique de l' Université de Strasbourg.[1] The Introduction is followed by a dozen pages of Bibliography. We then are given (Part I) a list of fifty *Ordines Romani* found in the manuscripts analysed. The next four hundred and fifty pages (Part II) are devoted to a full analysis of some eighty-six manuscripts, with clear indications of the book in which the texts may be found—if they have already been printed. Part III sets out very briefly the important conclusions arrived at. Copious indices of *Initia,* MSS., Proper Names and contents will render the use of the volume a joy to those who may have to handle it.

The study of the Roman Liturgy made a great step forward when in 1689 Dom J. Mabillon published in Paris the second volume of his *Museum Italicum,* and added to the Introduction the text of sixteen *Ordines Romani,* reprinted in volume 78 of Migne's Latin Patrology. In that Introduction he dealt with the ancient Basilicas, the Clergy of the City of Rome, the *Collectae,* the Stations and the Litanies, the Rites of the Pope's Mass, Communion under both kinds, the Saturday before Palm Sunday, Holy Week, Roman Ordinations, the Consecration of the Pope—the whole forming a rich treasure-house of materials for the history of the Roman Liturgy.

Since Mabillon's day other *Ordines* have been published by Gerbert (Monumenta Veteris liturgiae Alemannicae, 1770), Martène (De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, 1700), De Rossi (Inscrip. Christ : II, 1, 39), Duchesne and Kösters. The difficulty of using them, however, was that there had not been a sufficiently critical investigation into their history, structure, and date to enable scholars to utilize the data they contained without hesitation.

The importance of M. Andrieu's twenty years of labour is that he gives us the key to the use of the *Ordines* and shows as clearly as possible what a break took place in the history of the Roman Liturgy in the tenth century. The book constitutes a new chapter in the history of Liturgy, and in particular takes us back to the origins of the *Pontificale Romanum.* Some of our readers will remember Mgr. Batiffol's *Introduction au*

[1] Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, rue de Namur 40, Louvain. 90 fr.

Pontifical Romain, at the Semaine Liturgique of Louvain in 1911, when he took the history of the text back to Durandus in 1295. Now we are able to see the links connecting the earliest books of Roman Ceremonial with the thirteenth century Pontifical.

The Ordines Romani take their place among the most ancient documents of the Latin Liturgy. In bygone days they were the handbook to the carrying out of the principal ceremonies: the Mass, Baptism, Ordinations, Dedication of Churches, the Office of Holy Week and of the great feasts of the Christian Year. In the beginning they were simple descriptions setting out the sequence and order of ritual acts as now do the minute rubrics of the Missal and of the Pontifical.

Strictly speaking the term "*Ordines Romani*" ought to be confined to ceremony-books of purely Roman origin, descriptive of the Liturgy of the City of Rome. They are few in number, and in the course of their peregrinations in Frankish lands they became composite handbooks embodying local traditions as well, but keeping the designation of Roman, and eventually they found their way back to Rome.

The Roman Sacramentaries, first the Gelasian, later the Gregorian, found their way across the Alps, gradually disintegrated local traditions and eventually triumphed in Frankish lands under Charlemagne. Now the Sacramentary was not self-explanatory: the text of the prayers was without rubrics, so that a Frankish priest needed an "*Ordo Romanus*" if he was to use the Roman books as they should be used.

Early in the ninth century we find a collection of *Ordines* for Church use, dealing with various rites, to meet the needs of those who are to be initiated into Roman ceremonial. Such was the Montpellier MS. Later we find a gallicanized collection of *Ordines* bringing it more into harmony with Frankish customs, particularly relating to ordinations. The grouping of Episcopal functions on those lines is found at the beginning of the ninth century in the Verona Codex 92: the nucleus of a true *Pontificale.* In another type of collection of *Ordines,* due to the Carlovingian insistance on Clergy Examinations, we find them embedded in liturgico-dogmatic *Summae* drawn up for the instruction of the Clergy.

In the history of the spread of the *Ordines,* whether for Church use or for didactic use, the outstanding event is the appearance in the tenth century at Mayence, in the Rhineland, of a Romano-Germanic Pontifical—destined as history shows to be the link between the old *Ordines* and the modern *Pontificale.* The analysis of its sources gives us some genuine Roman Ordines such as Mabillon's Ordo IX (1-6), some remodelled Ordines adapted to Cisalpine use, and the *Ordo Romanus antiquus* of Hittorpius, a disconcerting grouping of Frankish customs and Roman memories. In its earlier forms the *Ordines* included were archaic in text, but subsequent transcribers

eliminate the archaisms, and leave room for both rubrics and formulas of prayer. Those formulas, the essential part of the pontifical, represent the liturgical practice of the Rhineland. The rapid diffusions of the work of the Monk of St. Alban's Abbey at Mayence helped to unify ceremonial practice first within the Empire and later throughout the West; Mayence was the old religious capital of Germany, the See of St. Boniface.

The tenth century marks a break in the history of the Roman Liturgy. In the sad state of affairs subsequent to the death of John VIII (December 16th, 882), no less than twenty popes had succeeded, in the midst of tumult and scandal, to the throne of Peter, before Otto I crossed the Alps (950) with his train of German Archbishops and Bishops. In order to revivify the life of her Basilicas, Rome accepted the composite liturgy brought by her reformers from the North, and its sway was assured by the sad condition of things which allowed the Empire and the Germanic Church to assume a markedly preponderant influence in Rome. When after Gregory VII and Innocent III Rome had become once more, for Latin Christianity, the regulating standard of the Liturgy, she spread throughout the world the rubrics and the formulas contained in the book that came to her from beyond the Alps. The Roman Pontifical of the thirteenth century is but a second edition of the tenth century Romano-Germanic Pontifical of Mayence. It was the thirteenth century Pontifical that furnished the material for the Pontifical of Durandus, which, when it had been deprived in 1485 of the sections now forming the *Rituale,* and had been revised by Clement VIII, Urban VIII and Benedict XIV, became our present *Pontificale Romanum.*

The whole work reflects the greatest credit upon M. Andrieu : the patient plodding verification of apparently trivial points has culminated in his being able to place in the hands of scholars throughout the world an instrument for liturgical work it would be difficult to parallel in modern times. The credit of showing the break which occurred in the tenth century belongs to M. Andrieu, as does also that of showing the importance both of the tenth century Romano-Germanic Pontifical and of the Roman thirteenth century Pontifical.

The second volume containing a critical text of the *Ordines Romani* is promised for an early date.

Dom Pierre de Puniet concludes his historical commentary on *Le Pontifical Romain.* The second volume is concerned with the rites of the Consecration of a Bishop, the Blessing of Abbots and Abbesses, the Consecration of Virgins, the Coronation Service, and the Blessing of Knights. He then passes on to the Rite of the Dedication of an Altar, of a Church and the Blessing of the objects used in Church. He concludes with a study on the Rites connected with the Penitents, and on the Consecration of the Holy Oils.

Dom de Puniet writes (p. 248) : " La théorie très généralement

admise aujourd'hui enseigne que les basiliques Chrétiennes du iv^e siècle ont copié les grandes maisons romaines de l'époque et leur ont emprunté une bonne partie de leurs éléments." Such a statement could not be made by anyone who had seen the pre-Christian underground basilica outside the Porta Maggiore.

Many who know the *Leçons de Liturgie à l'usage des Séminaristes,* by Monsieur L. Hébert, will be glad to hear that the new edition revised by Monsieur Grignon is now completed. Vol. I (1931) deals with the Roman Breviary and the Ritual; Vol. II (1931) the Roman Missal; Vol. III (1930) the Ceremonies of Solemn Functions. The Publishers are Berche et Pagis, rue de Rennes, 69, Paris; the cost is eighteen francs a volume.

Canon MacMahon, of Clonliffe, publishes the third edition[2] of his *Liturgical Catcchism* with its simple explanations of the purpose and contents of a Catholic Church, the Mass and the history of its formulas, the Liturgical Year and its composition. It is certainly well calculated to stimulate the active participation of the faithful in the sacrifice of the Mass.

Father Aloysius, O.S.F.C., has compiled from *The Voice of the Church, The Pocket Missal,*[3] adapted for the use of a busy professional or working man. The Common of the Mass is given in Latin and in English, the Proper Masses for Sundays and Holidays of Obligation in English only. A selection of Prayers for private devotion is added. Under the title of *Dona Eis Requiem*[4] Fr. Aloysius has brought together the Office and Mass for the Dead, in Latin and English, together with the Burial Service and some indulgenced devotions. The value of the tastefully presented little volume is increased by the inclusion of the Solesmes Chant for the Invitatory, the *Ego Sum,* the Mass for the Dead, the *Libera* and the *In Paradisum.*

The Divine Office: a study of the Roman Breviary, by the Rev. E. J. Quigley,[5] is the second impression of the book which appeared in 1920 and to which has been added as an Appendix some suggestions in aid to a devout recitation of the Psalms.

A very good little publication by the Abbé J. Mury *Ce qu'on peut apprendre dans une église*[6] with 192 illustrations and an interesting historical, dogmatic and liturgical commentary suggests the desirability of a little work on similar lines in English. A translation would be useless.

The first volume of a new Flammarion Series "Les Belles Fêtes" has appeared: *Les Rogationes*: quite a charming account of the Major Litanies at Rome and of the Rogations and their origin in Gaul. The author, Jean Balde, writes in a somewhat

[2] Gill. Dublin. 2s. 6d.

[3] Gill, Dublin. 1s. 6d.

[4] Gill. 2s.

[5] Gill, Dublin. 1930. 5s.

[6] Editions Publiroc, Marseille. 9 fr.

lyrical vein but brings to life the meaning of the invocations of the Litany of the Saints with remarkable success.

The Belgian Semaine Liturgique which began in 1912 has now become a stable institution : its publication of the Papers read form a valuable repertoire of practical liturgical teaching. The first Semaines were general in their range. On their revival after the War the tendency became to centre the teaching around definite points. Thus the Cours et Conférences *Des Semaines Liturgiques,* tome III (Malines, 1924), treats of the teaching of Religion through the Liturgy, the restoration of real Parochial life through the Liturgy and the Spiritual life and the Liturgy. Tome IV (Louvain, 1925) concentrates on " the Parish," considered from the practical Liturgical point of view. Tome V (Huy., 1926) is devoted entirely to the study of the Holy Mass and is full of material for instruction. Tome VI (Louvain, 1927) studies more in detail the structure of the Mass from the Introit to the Offertory. Tome VII (Tournai, 1928) is chiefly concerned with the Canon of the Mass. The various volumes are published by Desclée de Brouwer et Cie, 22, Quai aux Bois, Bruges. A new volume has just come to hand, tome IX (Antwerp, 1930), and is given up to an account of the Liturgical movement in different lands. The " Rapport sur le mouvement liturgique en Angleterre " is by Abbot Cabrol, and must have left a deplorable impression on the Continental Catholics who heard it. On p. 108 he embodies " une autre enquête à laquelle a bien voulu se livrer à ma prière une femme fort distinguée." This good lady found that in the Convents in which she gave lessons in Plain Song there was a marked improvement between 1910 and 1925. " Dans les paroisses, surtout au nord de l'Angleterre, le curé s'efforce d'éveiller l'intérêt pour la liturgie et d'établir les bonnes méthodes. Dominicains et Franciscains dans leurs noviciats font donner des leçons de chant grégorien ; les Salésiens, à Oxford, se distinguent par leur zèle. Dans la fameuse communauté de Saint Joseph de Mill Hill la messe et les vêpres sont exécutés en plain chant. Dans la plupart des couvents et pensionnats de jeunes filles, on constate un mouvement en l'honneur du plain-chant. . . . En même temps on est obligé de constater dans cette enquête que ce réveil en faveur du chant grégorien n'est pas accompagné d'un zèle égal pour l'enseignement liturgique. Ici règne en général une grande ignorance. Ni leçons de liturgie, ni conférences, ni sermons sur ce sujet. . . ."

It is well that the Clergy should know what is being said about them to their brethren abroad.

II. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

By Father James O'Mahony, O.M.Cap., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt.

M. Gilson claims that St. Thomas was the first modern philosopher.[7] He bases his claim on the fact that Aquinas was

[7] *Etudes de philosophie médiévale,* 1921. Preface.

the first in point of time to have drawn a hard and fast line between the two orders of nature and the supernatural. St. Thomas certainly distinguished faith and reason very clearly, and, as a consequence, philosophy and theology. Catholic philosophers were naturally grateful, for they could, on the strength of that, boast autonomy for their philosophy and meet the adversary on his own grounds.

A necessary division of labour had the effect of making the distinction introduced by St. Thomas look very like a separation of philosophy from theology. The philosophy of Ethics had to be taught independently of Moral Theology. What is the result? Catholic philosophers themselves have become uneasy. What professor of Ethics, for instance, has not had some scruples about his treatment of the final end? As a natural philosophy Ethics takes account of a natural final end, and few are unaware of the difficulties inherent even in the Thomistic treatment of the natural final end and the really ultimate end. If by revelation we know that there is really only one final end for human action, a supernatural one, and if Ethics by hypothesis takes no account of this supernatural end, is there not just the danger that the student who merely studies Ethics will come to believe that the distinction between philosophy and theology represents a real division or separation of things? The rationalist will seek from Ethics a complete rule of life, but the Catholic student may not do so.

De facto, the present order of things, is bound up with Christ. The supernatural is no mere juridical or extrinsic denominator: it enters into creation, modifies its shape and contour and gives a unitary orientation to human living. It follows that, as there is but one life, there can be only one rule of life and one morality, that of Christ. The distinction, therefore, made by St. Thomas must not be erected into a separation, and though for practical purposes Ethics has to be taught separately, it were well for the student to know how his Ethics is to be linked up with the facts of revelation.

For this purpose I know of no better book than that just published by M. L'Abbé J. Leclercq.[8] Another attempt to go over the same ground is contained in the recent volumes of M. Sertillanges, O.P. M. Leclercq is himself a Professor of Moral Philosophy at Brussels. In 1927 he published two very stimulating volumes on Ethical problems,[9] but the present volume is more actual and supplies a real want, that of linking up moral philosophy with the facts of revelation and of giving a synthesis that would correspond to Christian Morality. M. Leclercq writes with force and originality. He has thought out things for himself. It is evident that he knows St. Thomas, and though in the present volume he refrains from citing others

[8] *Le retour à Jesus,* Editions de la Cité Chrétienne, Bruxelles. 1931. 1 vol. in-8vo. (14×20). 376 pages. 25 fr. belgas.

[9] J. Leclercq, *Leçons de droit naturel,* 2 vols. Etudes morales, sociales et juridiques, Louvain.

it is clear that he is very much *au courant* with present-day thought. The *Retour à Jesus*, like *Notre Vie*,[10] is an ideal book for the priest who knows his moral theology but has only a hazy remembrance of what he read in moral philosophy.

There is just another problem with which the student of moral theology is conversant. He has learnt to draw a hard and fast line between what is of strict obligation and what is not of obligation. But he must know that when that has been fixed there is another problem which has to do with the ideal and with the perfection to which we are obliged. Moral theologians have always been accused of stressing the former question at the expense of the latter. It is well to know that here again there is a tendency to introduce unity into morals and not to stop short at telling people what they may, or may not, do under penalty of sin. This tendency is exemplified in the writings of Fr. Vermeersch;[11] it is also clearly evident in the work of M. Leclercq. The thesis that all are called to perfection is ably expounded. He writes sanely and discriminately about the *Status perfectionis*, and if what he writes on p. 108 be remembered, there will be little cause for dispute. Other excellent points there are in this book, *Le retour à Jesus*, particularly what he has to say about the theocentric character of religion, and also, in this context, the excellent pages devoted to the question of contemplation and apostolate.[12] Here is a specimen remark: "Mais où l'esprit moderne se trompe, c'est lorsqu'il s'imagine qū'on ne puisse être un bon chrétien sans avoir la préoccupation précise et *actuelle* de faire du bien aux ames."[13]

The book just mentioned is that of an enlightened essayist, attractive, and free from an imposing array of authorities. Many of the same ideas appear in a new *Introductio in Theologiam Spiritualem*, by P. Jacobus Heerinckx, O.F.M.,[14] but in a different form. This *Introductio* is a text-book, somewhat like that of Tanquerey's *Précis de théologie ascétique et mystique*. P. Jacobus emphasizes the necessity for going on to ascetical and mystical theology, somewhat aggressively perhaps: "Multi sacerdotes tum saeculares tum regulares cum zelo Dei verbum praedicant; sed nonne dicendum est illos generatim loquendi nimis in *via purgativa sistere?*" At times he is somewhat curt in his criticism of contemporary writers,[15] but he does not seem to have ignored anybody. His reader will be rewarded with a very exhaustive bibliography on the initial problems of Ascetical and Mystical Theology.

[10] A. D. Sertillanges, *Notre Vie*, 2 vols Editions de la Revue des jeunes, Desclée, Paris.

[11] *Theologia moralis*. 2 vols. Roma.

[12] Op. cit., pp. 34 sqq.

[13] Op. cit., 311 sqq.; *Ibid.*, p. 319.

[14] P. Jacobus Heerinckx, O.F.M. *Introductio in theologiam spiritualem. asceticam et mysticam*. In 8vo. 1931. pp. 356.1.15, Taurini-Romae, Marietti.

[15] *cf.* pp. 177, 178.

Of very particular interest for English readers is a book of Spiritual Exercises, by Robert Southwell, S.J., now edited for the first time.[16] Southwell was of Norfolk, and was martyred at Tyburn on February 21st, 1594-5. The beatification of the English Martyrs in 1929 naturally renews our interest in them. Besides, there is always an authentic ring about the spiritual writings of a man who has sealed them with his blood. It is strange that these writings of Southwell were neglected even when the writings of the martyrs were collected for the process of Beatification. They have now been excellently edited by J. M. De Buck, S.J., and translated by Right Rev. Mgr. P. E. Hallet. Both the Latin and English texts are given, and it will be found that these notes form an excellent commentary of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.

It will be of interest also to know that John Oxenham has discovered the saintly Curé D'Ars. He writes enthusiastically of him in a new book just published.[17] Frankly he writes as a sound and staunch Protestant, but it must be admitted that he writes attractively and reverently of " a Saint of the Roman Church." There are some *obiter dicta* with which one may quarrel. Take this one, apropos of Jean-Marie's vow, when Latin proved difficult, to go to the tomb of St. François Régis at Louvesc on a pilgrimage: " How exactly this was going to help him with the Latin grammar it is hard to understand. . . ." But then the man who made the pilgrimage understood what John Oxenham does not. I notice also that among his sources the author makes no mention of H. Ghéon's excellent little book on the Curé D'Ars,[18] though the latter, so it seems to me, would form a necessary supplement to that of Oxenham if the real inner secret of the Saint is to be grasped. John Oxenham has discovered a " good thing " in the Curé D'Ars, and he has striven manfully to share his enjoyment with his fellows.

The Eucharist, from the French of Raoul Plus, S.J.[19] Yet another book from P. Plus, written with the same enthusiasm we have learned to expect from him. His aim has been " to expound, as accurately as possible and without critical erudition, the Catholic *doctrine* of the Eucharist."[20] At every stage he suggests the transcendental truths that a proper appreciation of Eucharistic cult necessarily entails. Holy Communion is not dissevered from the Mass as sacrifice, and though he does not adduce the deeper reasons given by St. Thomas for the Eucharistic presence in us over and above that of the Holy Trinity in virtue

[16] *Spiritual Exercises and Devotions of Blessed Robert Southwell, S.J.* Sheed & Ward. Price 5s.

[17] John Oxenham, *A Saint in the Making.* Longmans. pp. i-xi, 208. Price 5s.

[18] *The Secret of the Curè D'Ars,* trans. by F. J. Sheed. pp. 218. 7s 6d. Sheed & Ward.

[19] Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. pp. 93. Price 3s. 6d.

[20] p. 88.

of Baptism, he says this: "Our Lord instituted the Eucharist not so much to give us the Real Presence, as to unite us with the sacrifice of Calvary which He renews in the Mass."[21] That is well said. P. Plus also emphasizes the other fundamental aspect of the Eucharist as an incorporation with Christ and through Christ with one another. Chapter VIII is devoted to the Eucharist as a Social Bond, with the idea of showing that "the masterpiece of the Eucharist is the 'recapitulation, the compenetration of the Church, of the whole of humanity with Christ, and through Christ, with God.'" These are just the two fundamental aspects of the Eucharist that need to be stressed to-day. We are glad to find that P. Plus has done so, and thereby shown an appreciation of the liturgical movement which is destined to do much towards a more enlightened appreciation of our religion. The author deals with the sacrifice of the Mass, with the mode of Christ's presence and with those other problems that are treated in the Tract on the Eucharist. His chief aim being an exposition of the *doctrine* of the Eucharist he has perhaps laid himself open to criticism when he speaks of the Last Supper, Calvary, and the Mass as three "moments" in one sacrifice,[22] for then the theory he holds about the sacrifice of the Mass peeps through. The Church allows freedom here, of course, and each one may select the theory that appeals most to him—provided he does not put it forward as the *doctrine* of the Eucharist. There can be little doubt of the efficacy of stressing the unity of the Mass and the Cross for popular devotion, but some of us are also anxious to retain the diversity of the Mass as a sacrifice true and proper without compromising its fundamental unity with the sacrifice of Calvary. Leaving that aside—indeed, P. Plus scarcely deserves the stricture—we have found his little book very informative and admirably written.

III. ECCLESIASTICAL ART.

SAINT UNCUMBER.

By the Rev. Ivor Daniel.

In the pages of mediæval hagiography there is some mention of a bearded lady called "Wilgefortis," who was invoked by our English ancestors as "Saint Uncumber." On the principle which presided in the choice of Saint Expeditus as the patron of expeditious solutions one might be tempted to suggest the Uncumberer as the patron of those who would wish to rid our churches, convents, and schools of the ever-growing accumulation of grotesque or inadequate representations purporting to represent Our Lord, Our Lady and the Saints of God.

Monsieur Camille Mauclair, President of the "Association des

[21] p.7.

[22] *Op. Cit.* p. 47.

critiques d'art français," says, in an article entitled " La laideur à l'église " (*Eclaireur de Nice* : 3/4/1931) :

> " There is to-day a plague of pious donors. Once they offered masterpieces by Van Eyck or Memling in which they figured on their knees in a corner. Now they offer horrible Saint-Sulpiceries—so called because they are produced by the thousand in the Quartier St. Sulpice at Paris. The ugliness of these objects is a matter of indifference to the donor, or to the parish-priest or to both. If a priest is convinced of the high principles of religious art, if he knows what was decreed by the admirable bishops who, during the period of Romanesque art, at the time of the Council of Trent, and during the sixteenth century, fixed the rules of mystical representation and collaborated in spirit with the great masters, he is called intransigent, and almost suspected of unorthodoxy. To get peace and quietness he has to admit artistic horrors into his Church. . . .
>
> " No (art loving) visitor, believer or not, who enters a cathedral can but suffer when he sees, in an atmosphere of admirable architecture and religious recollection, the grotesque statues, like nougat or suet, decorated in blue, rose, or carmine, and bedaubed with gold paint—lamentable in design and stupid in expression."

No continental traveller can fail to endorse the justice of this complaint. While our Protestantized English Cathedrals, once so neglected, are now, in the main, swept and sparingly garnished, the great Catholic fanes of Europe present an accumulation of pious furniture among which the surviving masterpieces of the ages of faith seem to be considered as antiquarian objects, retained for the purpose of extracting fees from tourists, and succeeded for purposes of devotion by the most meretricious productions of the modern church furnisher. In front of a once beautiful altar-piece, almost blacked out with varnish and dirt, one will find perhaps a simpering doll in a gilt-edged habit, with plucked eyebrows and encarmined lips, which purports to represent and honour a humble daughter of Carmel! At the foot of a superb Byzantine crucifix a tawdry and unnecessary second crucifix, of moulded metal mis-named brass, keeps company with six candlesticks of the same pattern—a pattern which can, alas, be found in half the churches of France.

Near an altar where a smoky kerosene lamp burns (if it has not " gone out ") by an uncurtained and shabby Tabernacle our attention is diverted by a life-size statue which purports to convey an impression of the loving Saviour Who left Himself to us in the Sacrament of the Altar. In one and the same church we find half a dozen representations of Our Lady, ranging from an ancient and usually neglected masterpiece to a travesty of the Apparition of Lourdes, in which the neck of Our Lady seems to emulate the characteristic attributed to a heroine of Scottish song! The venerable Curé d'Ars becomes a beady-eyed

old gentleman with a smart cotta edged with lace and a spade-shaped stole of unhealthy mauve. A sex-less St. Michael, with an expressionless countenance, and the limbs of Apollo—more or less—stands near a St. Joan of Arc who doesn't look as if she could have ever heard or understood a Heavenly voice!

Such is our experience on the Continent—and, if we are watchful, we can but realize with shame and sorrow that the same flood of machine-made mediocrity and ugliness is tending to invade and spoil the churches which we are now building to replace our lost heritage of splendour. No sooner has an architect left a building in the beauty of simplicity than a pious donor comes along with a beaming St. Anthony, whose rosy features, surmounted by a tonsure with becoming curls at the edges, do honour to the neat habit from which his pink-and-white feet peep out with effect. In a marvellously beautiful country church of the basilican type, adorned with noble mosaic, we recently encountered an unnecessary and incongruous statue of the oft-repeated series, which is known to the wholesale manufacturers as the " Sacré Cœur de Montmartre." In a Pro-Cathedral, already jostling with statues, we found that a reproduction of a well-known ikon, quite " popular " in appeal, had been " skied " to make way for a huge mass of plaster-cast in which a beggar writhed at the feet of St. Anthony. Humbler churches and chapels, convents, and schools are increasingly provided with brackets and stands which support statues of all shapes and sizes, often in close proximity, and easily recognizable in the illustrated catalogues which so often bring the postman to our doors.

One of these comes to hand appositely as I write these very lines. It emanates from an Italian manufacturer who offers such objects as " Body of Christ with or without Cross," and laments that " the narrow size of this catalogue don't let represent all my statues." He will, however, " garantee (sic) for the right style," and appends testimonials, of which one runs textually as follows :

> " In the time have arrived goods which of you with great hopeful I ordered. They are to exceed all of my expectation, and will cause to my people a joyful astound."

Further examination of the catalogue would suggest that, in some cases at least, the " astound " might be anything but " joyful."

A frequent excuse for these acquisitions is that " the people like them." Some of them may do so—they are used to them, and they have never seen anything else. Piety—and very true piety—may be independent of taste, but that is no reason for shocking the sensibilities of those who have taste and would fain be pious.

In a prominent church of a great diocese, of which the Ordinary used to recommend " coloured statues " as a necessity

for the piety of the masses, there is a simple and beautiful statue of white marble. Despite its lack of gaudy ornament it is seldom without suppliants, and its votive stand is always bright with the tapers of faith.

While we attempt to avoid the lower depths of commercial vulgarity we must beware of rushing to the opposite extreme, and furnishing our churches with the self-conscious productions of what is known as "New Art." If we replace a "Munich Madonna" by an impossibly elongated figure with an indication of Asiatic eyes we shall please nobody but affected æsthetes who do not matter. We must beware of passing fads, and hesitate before we replace a set of Stations which principally consists of gaudy frames and over-muscled executioners by a frameless set in which the executioners have legs like nine-pins.

The important point is that we should do nothing in a hurry or without adequate advice. It seems to the writer that, where subjective judgment is obviously so varied, the approbation of church furnishings might be reserved to a small committee appointed by the chief pastor of the diocese. Once the objects have been acquired they are there to stay—and it is futile to hope for an "act of God" which will result in their disappearance. It is always difficult and sometimes morally impossible to rid the church of objects which have already been given, accepted, and solemnly blessed. This statue, you will be reminded, is a memorial of a pious family which once gave far too much money for the purpose. That one is the monument of a hero who lies in the depths of the ocean. The other was subscribed for by the pence of the Children of Mary. How can we hurt the feelings of those whose pastor conned the pages of a catalogue when asked to choose a statue, or heaved an inefficient sigh when his rich parishioner returned from Lisieux with a super-decorated product of the very latest machinery? Can we not, therefore, have a kind of Court of Arches which would guide our taste and control our subjective or transitory enthusiasms in accordance with the noble tradition to which Monsieur Mauclair refers? Otherwise we may, in time, be obliged to contrive cloisters to contain the Valhalla of accumulated statuary which time and lack of forethought have cumbered us with—or emulate our continental brethren and relegate them to the dusty obscurity of a loft.

In a Trappist monastery I recently admired the admirable and becoming severity of the three traditional altars. From picture postcards still in circulation I found that two of them were until recently obscured by artificial rock-work which towered up into the lines of the architecture to represent Calvary and Lourdes. A truer sense of the Cistercian tradition has bravely abolished them—they were but scenery mistakenly intended to edify pious visitors—but who will have the courage to abolish the "glory" of lath and plaster which disfigures the sanctuary of Amiens, or remove the colossal mass of marble in

honour of which the eighteenth-century canons of Chartres destroyed the windows given by St. Louis? Let us take time by the forelock. We have chapels, churches, and even cathedrals in the making. Can we not dispense with the future services of an uncumberer by refusing to accept internal decorations which are contrary to sane tradition, and not likely to stand the test of time?

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

By the Rev. A. Bentley, Ph.D., M.A.

THE IMPEDIMENT OF CONSANGUINITY.

An *Instruction*, issued by the S.C. of the Sacraments on August 1st, 1931, laments the frequency of appeals for matrimonial dispensations by parties mutually related either as uncle and niece, or as nephew and aunt: *super impedimento consanguinitatis in primo gradu lineae collateralis, mixto cum secundo*. The substance of the consequent recommendations of the Sacred Congregation will be sufficiently indicated by a précis.

The practice is described as spreading from place to place like an infection. It is therefore within the power of parish priests to perform a most useful service by timely warnings, especially in sermons and catechetical instructions. It should be shown that the Church has established impediments to safeguard the right formation and ordered existence of families, and the best interests of the progeny in birth and upbringing. Priests will strive to discourage too great readiness to ask for dispensations, especially from the more important impediments, and only take account of really grave and urgent reasons. Where there are such reasons, prudence suggests that they should be communicated to ecclesiastical authority through parents or parish priest, before promises of marriage are made and publicly announced.

We are reminded that the Holy See has not failed, when occasion offered, to invoke earlier canonical prescriptions and especially those of the Council of Trent. A case in point is the autograph Letter of Gregory XVI, November 22nd, 1836, containing provisions concerning this impediment which are still in force. The Code has not altered them, and the S.C., following the practice handed on by the Apostolic Datary, has consistently applied the same rules.

The bishops themselves, therefore, are warned against a readiness to admit and to recommend petitions for dispensations. They should bear in mind the dangers and drawbacks which are inevitable where the petitioners are so closely allied by blood, and often so different in age. Conjugal relations are rarely, in such cases, peaceful and enduring. The consequences are that the family bond is weakened, serious hurt even of a physical nature is inflicted on the children and their posterity, and, physiologists add, the very physical and moral defects of the parents are usually inherited in an aggravated form. It should also be remembered that too great indulgence in granting dispensations is tantamount to encouraging a lowering of those standards of mutual respect and of purity, which should

characterize the intimate association of persons so closely united by ties of blood. It must be clear to all, therefore, that the discipline of matrimonial impediments, which safeguards the dignity and sanctity of marriage, ought not to be impaired by frequent dispensations. Otherwise, the cause of morality, the peace of families and the highest interests of the State will alike suffer.

The only just and sufficiently serious grounds for dispensations are those admitted in canonical prescriptions and in the regular usage of the Holy See. Such are: the removal of notable scandal, the settlement of grave questions touching succession to property, the relief of a family involved in great difficulties or in abject poverty. Other reasons, commonly admitted in case of even greater impediments, are hardly sufficient here, e.g.: "angustia loci, aetas mulieris superadulta, carentia dotis et similia." It is, however, acknowledged that such reasons, in themselves inadequate, may acquire a suasive power by accumulation, *iuxta regulam iuris: singula quae non prosunt, simul collecta iuvant.*

Henceforward, therefore, diocesan Ordinaries are asked to receive and commend only those petitions which are supported by really canonical reasons in the sense explained. When no grave inconvenience prevents them, they should not think it too much to write a special commendatory letter, stating the age of the parties, the canonical grounds for each dispensation, and other opportune remarks. If the Ordinary is prevented from writing a letter, the petition must at least receive the bishop's signature, and be commended *speciali modo.* (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 413.)

A DIOCESAN ADMINISTRATION TAX.

The S.C. of the Council has published the following *dubium* and response: *D. An distributiones quotidianae obnoxiae sint tributo, de quo in articulo 57 Instructionum diei 20 Iunii 1929 circa bona ecclesiastica. R. Negative, seu distributiones quotidianas, et, si omnes beneficii reditus distributionibus constent, tertiam earundem partem, tributo de quo agitur non esse obnoxias.* (Romana et aliarum, March 20th, 1931; A.A.S., XXIII, p. 165.)

The Lateran Pact guaranteed the legal right of churches and other ecclesiastical institutions in Italy to hold and administer property under the supervision of ecclesiastical authority. Detailed *Instructions,* issued by the S.C. of the Council on June 20th, 1929, provided (inter alia) for the erection of Diocesan Administration Boards charged with this important task of supervision and control. At the same time, provision was made for the levy of a tax of 2% on the *net* income from all benefices to meet the costs of administration. (A.A.S., XXI, p. 384.)

Canonical prebends are clearly subject to this tax. But the question of a tax arises also in connection with the daily "distributiones inter praesentes" in choir. They are not strictly part of capitular benefices, but an additional stimulus and reward for attendance at capitular functions. We must remember, however, that, where such special funds do not exist, the bishop should supply them by a process of confiscating one-third of the revenues of all canonries, "dignities" and so forth, in accordance with canon 395, 1. Sums thus secured will return to the beneficiary, although in an indirect fashion and *ex alio titulo*. Must they therefore still be regarded as part of the net yield of his benefice, and so liable to taxation? Or are they exempt, as accidental emoluments to be deducted in the same way as other charges upon the revenue of a benefice? The official response shows that the funds set aside for distribution are exempt from tax, and if all the capitular revenues are converted in this manner, the requisite third will enjoy the same exemption.

THE KNIGHTS OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

A dispute between the Knights of Malta and the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre has recently been settled by the Holy See, after a Commission of Cardinals had investigated the questions under discussion. The following are the principal points in the new decree of the S.C. of Ceremonies, approved on August 5th, 1931.

The modern status of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre is defined in an Apostolic Letter of Pius IX, dated January 24th, 1868, and in subsequent legislation of August 3rd, 1888, May 3rd, 1907, and January 6th, 1928. Previous constitutions and privileges are withdrawn.

The Order may not, in future, lay claim to the title "*Sacred*, or *Military*, Order of Jerusalem." By pure favour of the present Pontiff, the additional epithet "of Jerusalem" (Hierosolymitanus) is allowed, so that the official designation will henceforth be "The Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre," or "The Hierosolymitan Order of Knights of the Holy Sepulchre." Incidentally, the Knights of Malta bear the official style of "Supreme Military Order of Jerusalem." The Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, who rules the Order of the Holy Sepulchre in the name of the Pope, must not be referred to as "Grand Master," but as "Permanent Rector and Administrator." The title "baiulivus" (bailiff or prefect) has likewise been abolished. The titles "Lieutenant" and "Excellency" are reserved for the representatives of the permanent Rector and Administrator. Whenever a new Knight is appointed by the Patriarch, the appointment, if ratified, will receive the *visa* of the Apostolic Chancery to ensure its recognition everywhere. (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 385.)

EXTERN SISTERS ATTACHED TO RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

Uniform statutes for all " out-Sisters," attached to convents of any Order whatsoever, received the approval of the Holy Father on July 16th, 1931. They will, therefore, come into force on December 2nd, three months after the insertion of the notice of approval in the *Acta* of September 1st. The *antistitae* of convents, in which there are such extern sisters of simple vows, may apply to the S.C. of Religious for copies of the statutes, which are printed at the Vatican Press. (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 380.)

THE INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS.

A decree of the Holy Office, which received papal approval on June 27th, 1931, declared four works of EDOUARD LE ROY to be " praedamnata ad normam can. 1399, 2°, 6° C.I.C. habenda, et in Indicem librorum prohibitorum inserenda " :

L'Exigence idéaliste et le fait de l'évolution. Paris, Boivin, 1927.

Le problème de Dieu. Paris, L'Artisan du Livre, 1929.

La pensée intuitive. 2 vols. Paris, Boivin, 1929-1930.

Les origines humaines et l'évolution de l'intelligence. Paris, Boivin, 1930.

(A.A.S., XXIII, p. 330.)

BOOK REVIEWS

Irish Monasticism: Origins and Early Development, by the Rev. John Ryan, S.J., M.A. (pp. 413. Longmans, Green & Co. 18*s*.)

The Irish people, for the delight of their friends and the greater confounding of their enemies, were, it has been held, created "different," and the "difference," if traceable throughout their history, is nowhere more evident than in their religious history. For the understanding of that history Fr. Ryan's book is of the highest importance, for he treats of origins, and he treats of them as a wealth of first-hand sources makes them known. His subject is not merely Irish Monasticism as such, but the story of its development in relation to the general monastic movement in the Church of the first seven centuries.

Hence the first section of his book which, in fifty-six pages, describes, with a masterly compression of much learning, the origin and fortunes of monasticism in the two hundred years which lie between St. Antony of Egypt and St. Patrick. The solitaries of the desert are recalled and the beginnings of the religious order under St. Pachomius. It was here that manual labour and obedience to a superior were first conceived as elements of an ascetic system; and it was here too that, in the next generation, the monk's dedication for life began to be sealed by an explicit vow solemnly made before witnesses. The life of these Egyptian pioneer monks is described, the practical moderation of its asceticism noted, and too its sane allowance for the mean of average possibility. Side by side with the progress of the ideal in Egypt there developed a movement equally strong in the East whose great hero is St. Basil. With St. Basil there came a new emphasis on the superiority of the monastic life lived in common over the older hermit ideal. His communities again were much smaller than the Pachomian foundations whose members were often numbered by hundreds, and his abbot's authority less despotic. Also, a mighty innovation this, to the monastery he attached a school and hospitals for the sick.

The monk, so far, was not as such priest or even cleric. The next stage in his development was due to the West where the first interest in monasticism is traceable to the exile in Europe of the great Archbishop of Alexandria, St. Athanasius. Forty years later, St. Jerome founded the first Roman monastery, and about the same time the Bishop of Vercelli, St. Eusebius, established a monastic life for the priests of his cathedral, an innovation that had a still greater patron in St. Augustine. One last type of monasticism as it developed in the West, and we come to St. Patrick. This last type is the monasticism of

St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, where the monks were eremitical in their manner of life and yet gave themselves to the conversion of the still pagan countrysides.

St. Martin, St. Augustine, St. Jerome and St. Patrick were all contemporaries; St. Athanasius, St. Basil and St. Pachomius belonged to the preceding generation. St. Patrick's mission to Ireland took place, then, at the very flood-tide of the first monastic movement, and inevitably the relation of his own life to that movement, the part played by monasticism in his work in Ireland, and the saint's influence on later monastic developments in Ireland are topics round which much controversy has centred. St. Patrick was himself, of course, a monk, and a member of the most famous community of his time, that established at Lérins, an island off the southern coast of Gaul. St. Patrick's work in organizing the permanent machinery of ecclesiastical government was inevitably conditioned by local circumstances. The absence of the towns, that were a feature of the imperial civilization whence he came, left him no choice but to improvise, and the sees he founded had for their centre not so much a town as a kind of religious settlement. Whether St. Patrick's assistants were all of them bound by monastic vows is a disputed point, and Fr. Ryan here differs from Bury who holds that they were. Though it is impossible to overestimate St. Patrick's own high opinion of the monastic state and the encouragement he gave to those who wished to adopt it, it was not to monks as such but to clerics, priests and bishops that he entrusted the missionary work, and the ecclesiastical *civitas* that was the centre of the diocese was not a monastery. Nevertheless, it differed little in the detail of its life from a monastic settlement, for it was a religious family living in obedience to its superior the bishop—bearing much the same relation to a monastery as a modern seminary would bear were there no such things as holidays and did the clergy live on in the seminary after ordination. Monasticism then, however important, had but a secondary place in St. Patrick's scheme of church organization, and in this he only followed tradition.

There was, however, to develop in the years that followed his death a curious reversal of this traditional relation and to the investigation of this peculiarity of early Irish Catholicism Fr. Ryan devotes four most interesting chapters.

In the forty years between St. Patrick's death and the turn of the century many of these settlements of clerics acquired, one by one, a monastic character and (*e.g.*, at Armagh) the bishop became the abbot. So far the change did not seriously interfere with the episcopal constitution of the church as the saint had founded it. But the next half century saw such a passion of enthusiasm for the monastic life that all else gave way before it. Before describing this Fr. Ryan gives us an account of the saints who were the founders of what was to develop so amazingly—St. Enda of Aran and St. Finnian of Clonard. St. Enda, the pioneer in Ireland of monasticism in

the strict sense, had had his training in Britain in that *Candida Casa* of St. Ninian's foundation in Galloway. St. Finnian was one of St. Enda's disciples, and how much he too owed to British influences, and how great a part a British monk, St. Gildas, played is traced out in some of this learned book's most fascinating pages. From Britain—which had it from Lérins—there came the tradition of study as a monastic discipline, and there came too the tendency to exalt the monastic ideal above the clerical that was in Ireland speedily to change all.

Abbots rather than bishops are henceforth the predominant figures and monasteries more important than sees, so that the see is lost to view behind the monastery, and if St. Finnian is himself bishop as well as abbot, he keeps the episcopal character well in the background. Jurisdiction is no longer confined to bishops, nor even to bishops and bishop-abbots, but is exercised equally by abbots who are not bishops at all. To bless and consecrate, to edify by the saintliness of his life and the example of his austerities—such was the bishop's vocation, while the rule of the flock fell to the abbot. Since certain sacraments necessitated bishops, in sees where the ruling abbot was not himself a bishop care was taken that one of his subjects was consecrated. So at Clonmacnoise and at Armagh itself an abbot in priest's orders ruled the monastery and the see, while within the monastery dwelt the bishop, one of the monks, giving himself to prayer and the ritual functions proper to his order. The monastic sentiment prevailed everywhere. The bishop-abbots—perhaps a half of the total—were abbots before they were bishops, and the dioceses, with boundaries none too fixed, waxed and waned in extent with the fortunes of the monastery that was their centre. The metropolitan see, in the canonical sense, ceased to exist and the essential connection between the episcopal order and ecclesiastical government bade fair to be lost to view. Priests other than those who were monks were few, and even the priests who were monks were few to an extent that excited foreign comment. Monks were the teachers, the preachers, and spiritual directors of the whole country, for non-monastic bishops and non-monastic sees were of almost negligible importance. As to the ancient thorny question of the relations between monks and ecclesiastical authority, such a question had, of course, no meaning at all in a régime where the monks were themselves the only authority.

Such are the topics that occupy Fr. Ryan for the first half of his book. The remaining two hundred pages are taken up with a description of the life of the monks during the first hundred years of the period (560-660). The monks were recruited almost exclusively from the higher and middle classes, and, generally, were received as novices towards adolescence. There was no systematic novitiate, but, in the care of a species of spiritual tutor, they were gradually initiated into the routine of the life and its spirit. It is hard to say whether there was a set period of probation or whether the reception of the novice

was left to the abbot's discretion. More certain is the fact that the reception was the occasion of a vow publicly made to live as a monk under perpetual obedience, and though there is no ground for supposing the vow contained an implicit obligation to poverty and perpetual chastity, these followed from the nature of the dedication. Obedience governed everything and though the solitary life was held in higher esteem than that of the community, the monk could not leave the community for the "desert" without his abbot's sanction. At the abbot's discretion too was the assignment of the monks for missionary work, preaching and the care of souls. The aim of this life, whose extraordinary severity Fr. Ryan illustrates through many pages, was to form *in each monk* a spirituality not merely high but heroic. In Irish monasticism there was no place for mediocrity.

The basis of the life was the public recitation of the Divine Office and frequent reception of the Sacraments, for the monks communicated regularly every week and in addition on feast-days. In all matters of private prayer and spiritual direction the leading influence was the teaching of the day's greatest spiritual expert Cassian. In view of recent controversies as to the place of manual work in the first Benedictine monasteries, it is interesting to note that among these Irish monks who held study in such honour—"to the Irish mind an illiterate monk was a contradiction in terms"—manual work, at least in part, was an obligation that fell upon all turn by turn. "The studious were warned that their love for books was not to lead them to any depreciation of more material work." What did the monks study? St. Patrick founded a tradition of purely religious studies where Latin's chief rôle was simply that of the medium through which more important matters were learnt. Later, thanks to the influence of St. Gildas, the wider tradition of Lérins obtained a footing, and there came to Ireland what still survived of the classical liberal education. Later still, following, no doubt, the example of St. Columcille, the ban was lifted from the old native literary culture, which since the conversion had been left to the bards as a heathen thing, and from the beginning of the seventh century the three traditions were fused into a new Christian culture. The chief study was, of course, that of the Bible; "it is impossible to over-estimate its place in the system." Though the Latin classics were well known it was far otherwise with Greek which up to this time (660) remained an unknown tongue.

A description of the more material régime follows—the more valuable once more because it keeps ever in view monastic life elsewhere. We learn of the scanty fare, the rare meal a day, the poor drink, water or a beer which writers equate with whey, the frequent fasts, the three Lents: Lent of Elias in Advent, Lent of Jesus in the Spring, Lent of Moses after Pentecost; and the hard rule which apparently never allowed the monk a normal night's sleep. Well might these monks' latest chronicler remark that the régime of St. Benedict's rule "would have

sounded incredible to Irish ears." Finally, we come to the monk's end. Sick, he is cared for tenderly, and death approaching confesses his sins and receives Holy Viaticum. Masses are said for his soul and he is buried with the Mass while on the thirtieth day after his death and on each succeeding annual anniversary, Mass for his soul once more, the brethren offering for its relief their prayers, their fasts and good works.

Fr. Ryan has done his work well. It is the work of a well-trained scholar, and while scholars will find it finished to their needs—a close and clearly indicated control of sources, three good indexes—it is so admirably written that it cannot but interest the general reader, too. It is one of those books whose publication marks the coming of a new and better era in our native historical scholarship. Fr. Ryan's many readers will look forward impatiently to the volumes in which he promises to complete his task.

PHILIP HUGHES.

SOVIET RUSSIA.

Das rote Russland. By Theodor Seibert. (Knorr und Hirth : Munchen. 4 M. 50.)

It has been granted to this generation of mankind, upon whom the ends of the earth are come, to live in times of disaster without parallel. All the historical terrors and revolutions, crashes of empire and horrors of invasion are often slight in comparison with events in the recent war. The mere epidemic after the war spread from sea to sea, girdled the earth and claimed millions of victims. The Chinese rivers, forces of utter devastation throughout the sombre history of the Far East, are now exacting a toll of tens of millions of dead, and at least an equal number of stricken and destitute. And lastly, there is Russia, with its Bolshevik movements, which dwarfs almost all else that has happened even in our terror-stricken lives.

Most of us cannot even begin to understand Russia. The peoples are too strange and exotic, too curious a blend of fanaticism and fatalism, of religion and revolution. Their language is unknown to us; their values and scales of values are different; their emphases and enthusiasm are not ours. They are as difficult to understand as their own music, in which delicacy and refinement of sound and melody seem to play in and out with things that convey nought but stark brutality and savagery. But not only the peoples, the land itself is unknown to us, unknown alike in its individuality and in its bewildering diversity of climates, temperatures, zones, occupations, interests, peoples. Our ignorance goes even further. We know little of the inner history of Russia down the centuries, and scandalously little of Russia under the Tzars, and even that trifle has violent political colourings. So much of the past.

The present régime is to us a bewilderment, a thing of sound

and fury signifying all the oldest and wildest of the heresies and negations, all the wickedness of tyranny, and all the wildness of onslaught against the very existence of our civilization, with all its Roman, Greek, Eastern, Jewish and Christian elements. We hear of resounding but ever-changing economic slogans, of perverse religious hate, of the perfection of mechanized equipment side by side with penury and hunger, of a communal life from which the treasured privacies and decencies of life are excluded, of the sinister debauchery of children, of murder and ostracism, of spy systems more perfect than the latest machinery, and of a reign of suspicion and terror that acknowledges no sacredness either of liberty or life.

This is the strange Russia depicted for us by enthusiastic communists as the Promised Land, and by sane observers as a very Hell. Above all—and this ought to be emphasized—this is the Russia depicted for us by travellers who spend but a few weeks or months in this immense country, which dwarfs Continents, seeing that they may not see, and hearing that they may not understand. Small wonder that we are bewildered!

Years ago men said "this cannot last, this Russian evil; it is too intrinsically wrong; it runs counter to the very foundation of our human nature; it tempts God; it will perish, and Russia, the real Russia, regenerated through suffering, will live again." But as the weary years passed, men saw that there was behind this horror a more fearful impetus than they had even dreamed. Slowly they realized that many Russians still possessed a terrible quality of conviction, fired with enthusiasm and even fanaticism —time was when we in the West had the same—which leads them to kill out-of-hand those who differ from them dangerously, and to be, themselves, utterly willing to die for a cause or an idea.

Since this Bolshevik thing stalked across the stage of the world, East and West, throwing everywhere long and hideous shadows, it has been to many, and probably to all who have ever lived on the borders of Russia, something of an obsession. The books only bewilder us: the stories of the refugees only stun us. Indeed, there settles down, after all the reading and hearing, a deeper gloom over us, and a greater incomprehensibility over the facts. There comes to us in this pervasive darkness only one conviction. Deep calls upon deep. The deep in our being answers this deep of Russian misery, and that deep surely calls upon the deep of God's mercy. If ever a land needed God, it is Russia—Russia, where Mass has been said for centuries, and where a beautiful liturgy has been loved.

These few words may serve to introduce Theodor Seibert's book on Red Russia to English readers. Unlike other authors, he has actually lived in Russia for four years or more, and kept house with his family in Bolshevik Moscow. He cites facts and figures, and shows, without undue display of detail, the changing scene in the changing years. He travelled far and saw much. This is no cry of horror from one who loves

Capitalist systems. In those systems he sees many a flaw. This is no cry of denunciation from one who hates communism: wherever possible, he will see good even in this fearful doctrine of sombre equality.

What he sees, above all, is the moral problem in its startling clarity, and on that account, we commend this volume to the clergy. He sees the degradation, the loss of individuality, the loss of the riches of personality, the loss of dignity in this grinding system that treats the masses as herds of mankind and not as men.

The book is not a political philosophy, nor is it episodic, like Fulop-Müller's *Geist und Gesicht des Bolshevismus*. It is a clear and unrhetorical description of each single factor in the life of Contemporary Soviet Russia.

We who believe that the issues at stake in the contemporary world are primarily neither financial, nor economic, but moral, will draw help from this remarkable volume. We may often differ from the author, but we cannot miss the note of sincerity, nor the note of terror. It is not a revolution that we need fear, nor the perfection of mechanical efficiency, nor even a five-years' plan, indeed, nothing either financial or economic. What we might well fear is a people who can unflinchingly kill others, and then die for their own convictions. They dwell in lands of unexhausted wealth, which cover a fair share of the habitable earth.

JOHN G. VANCE.

Property in the Eighteenth Century. By the Rev. Paschal Larkin, O.S.F.C., M.A., Ph.D. (Cork University Press and Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

In his *Property in the Eighteenth Century* Fr. Paschal Larkin gives us a report on the various ideas on property current in the eighteenth century. The full title, however, should be noted "With Special Reference to England and Locke" for, except for a chapter on America and a chapter on France, the latter necessarily a very cursory one, the book is taken up with the English development of the theories on property and usury left over from the Middle Ages. Even under the Commonwealth, except for certain idealists like Harrison and Winstanley, these mediæval theories remained intact. The eighteenth century was the first that definitely broke with the old Catholic social theories; it ended naturally with the French Revolution, for though France was Catholic in Sainthood it was little Catholic in its political or economic aspirations. It accepted non-Catholic philosophy and by trying to combine this with the faith produced a speedier dislocation of society than elsewhere. Men still dispute whether this was a disaster for France or no.

England, during the same period, as Fr. Larkin shows, was dominated by two writers: Harrison, with his explosive *Oceana*,

and Locke. From England the influence of these two spread so as to dominate the Continent of Europe. Both the French and American revolutions were founded on their theories, a strange paradox for their theories were not only independent but opposed. Karl Marx much later definitely formulated some of his principles in the very words of Locke.

How this amazing domination was effected, Fr. Larkin tells us as clearly as it can be told in 241 well-documented pages, from the collapse of the older Catholic theory of the conditional ownership of property to its replacement first in fact and then (by Locke's clear and dogmatic pronouncements) in theory by that of absolute ownership. It is interesting to note that it was in the name of absolute ownership and not in reaction against it that both the French and American revolutions were launched.

The other contribution of Locke to the theory of property, and in his eyes the more important and basic principle of the two, was that labour was the origin of property. A man owned all and only what he produced: "Whatsoever he removes out of the State (which) Nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with it and joined it to something that is his own and thereby makes it his property." Thus Locke maintained that a man could rightly own only the amount of land that he could till or use. Beyond that, ownership was unjust. Because of that, ownership was absolute even against the State. Because of that, too, property should not be taxed without the owner's consent. Since, too, property included "lives, liberties, and estates," no man should lie under a government or be forced to obey a law to which he had not given his consent. Thus he justified the whig "Glorious Revolution" of 1688.

The development of these ideas, especially in England, where life was noted for "less wretchedness and despair" than other countries, first in favour of the people, then in favour of capitalists, and lastly in favour of socialism is admirably depicted in this book which, though primarily written for students, contains much valuable matter for the consideration of every citizen. Its learned form is enlivened by clearness of style. It does not lack wit: "the pronouncements of the judges like the stars afforded little light because they were too high," "Voltaire who had travelled in order to laugh at men and Montesquieu who travelled in order to instruct them were both eloquent in their praise of English thought and English institutions," "history which at all times is an object lesson becomes at certain stages a judgment."

We would only say by way of criticism that Fr. Larkin seems to us to accept over-readily the standpoint of a particular school of economists and by his use at times of commendatory or denunciatory adjectives to irritate the reader into supposing that he is reading not a history but a tract. Perhaps, too, he is not always fair to his theorists. Is it true to say that the

right of all to some land necessarily implies communism in practice (p. 63)?

But these are minor issues compared with his well-marshalled arguments, his rich references on every page, the steady clearness of his vision, his wise judgments, his sane criticisms of finance and industrialism, his defence of capital as needing to be more and not less diffused, and his love of the land. These make Fr. Larkin's book invaluable not merely as a history of the past but as a guide to the future: "Let the value of Gold and Silver either rise or fall, the enjoyment of all Societies will ever depend upon the Fruits of the Earth and the Labour of the People" (p 190).

BEDE JARRETT, O.P.

Judgment on Birth Control. By R. de Guchteneere, M.D. (Sheed & Ward. pp. 223. 6*s*.)

Many priests require reliable information on the much advertised subject of Birth Control. When dealing with an individual they can correct or direct him in virtue of the ordinary theological teaching emphasized as that recently has been by the Encyclical *Casti Connubii*. But if they have to deal with this matter publicly in any capacity they must know the arguments of their adversaries and what is to be said for and against them on the grounds of science and pure reason. And even when demanding from a recalcitrant individual obedience to the law of God, and urging him by every supernatural consideration to forsake an evil practice, they may have an uneasy feeling that if only they knew more about the subject they could find natural motives to supplement those others or to prepare the way for them. Here is a book which can confidently be recommended to those who feel this need.

The author considers at length the economic, the medical and the moral aspects of Birth Control. As far as the present writer is able to determine no point of any significance has been omitted in the long medical chapter, and no conclusion is pressed beyond the strict value of the premises. But, on the other hand, no weakness of the opponents' defences is overlooked. It is an excellent piece of work.

The moral argument too is very well developed, even the metaphysical element of it and the confusion arising out of the use of the words "natural" and "unnatural." The true doctrine is stated and established, including the justification of the use of the *tempus ageneseos* with the latest scientific data respecting its determination.

The author rebuts the economic argument by pointing out that the population pressure, the slum dwellings and the poverty, which are alleged as a plea for Birth Control, should be attacked at their source; to attempt to ease their blighting incidence by a restriction of families is merely to establish more firmly these

iniquitous conditions. That is true and is a valid argument against all those who, exercising an influence in public affairs, are misdirecting their zeal and energy. But it is not of much use to the sufferer or to the mistaken persons who fancy that they see a way to the easement of conditions whose root-causes are beyond their control. This is not to minimize the force of a contention which has been insisted upon over and over again by the Supreme Pontiff and which the author has done well to stress, but merely to point out that in dealing with the individual we must here strongly insist on the supernatural motive of confidence in God and in the grace of the sacrament. (Cf. *Christian Marriage*. C.T.S. pp. 27, 28.)

T. E. Flynn.

The Burning Soul of St. John of the Cross. By Rodolphe Hoornaert, translated by Algar Thorold. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. 71. 3*s*.)

This is a very small but very compact book which describes the spiritual progress of St. John of the Cross from his pious and poverty-stricken boyhood through the martyrdom of the Dark Nights of Sense and Spirit to his victorious death in his fiftieth year. It is a noble story, dramatically told—too dramatically, I fear, for English ears; but those who can endure the strain of the author's consistently high pitch may discover a St. John more human though not less perfect than they had known.

T. E. Flynn.

Temples of Eternity. By Fr. R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. (Longmans. 5*s*.)

In these short essays Fr. Steuart faces some of the most difficult problems of the spiritual life, and with deft touches assured by philosophical and theological insight presents to his readers metaphysical and theological truth as the reality it is. Time and Eternity, Grace and Free-will, the Efficacy of Prayer, Participation of the Divine Nature, the Beatific Vision—these and such-like antinomies he resolves, or rather he shows that we can confidently accept them and find in them profit for our souls. Everywhere he manifests an appreciation of mystic values and never fails to communicate it.

The essays as they stand would appeal perhaps to educated readers only. They could, however, be expanded into sermons for the simplest congregations for whom these subjects are often considered to be too remote, too technical or too difficult. But our people have a right to these things; the world at large is aching for these things. Fr. Steuart has done a good work which should prove of profit to many. May the ripples spread. The book is small—about 150 pages—but beautifully produced.

T. E. Flynn.

The Franciscans. By Fr. James, O.S.F.C. (Sheed & Ward. 2*s.* 6*d.*) pp. 110.

Every religious order reproduces in the Mystical Body an aspect of the real Christ, so that by combining the orders you have the whole range of Christ's virtues imitated in an exalted degree. The speciality of the Franciscans is poverty, and mysticism bearing fruit in the apostolate. In this little book Fr. James recounts and discusses these ideals of his order. His competence for the task is evident from the easy manner in which he compresses a wealth of material into the small compass at his disposal.

The first chapter is devoted to St. Francis himself, his cult (*"Everybody's St. Francis"*), his life and rule, and emphasizes the true spirit of the Saint; no individualist he, or Protestant before the time, but Catholic to the core. The next chapter discusses the Church and the Franciscans (Franciscan piety and the liturgy, and the Franciscan families). The third chapter treats of Franciscan spirituality, their Mysticism and their apostolate both in the mission field, where they were already expanding in their founder's lifetime, and in the intellectual domain. The latter activity has met with criticism as being outside St. Francis' intention; but Fr. James is emphatic that St. Boñaventure and Scotus are true Franciscans, because their quest for knowledge was never allowed to supersede or obscure devotion, and was always undertaken for the love of souls. The fourth and final chapter is retrospective and considers the work that the Franciscans have done for the Church.

We heartily congratulate Fr. James on a splendid little book, full of material, in spite of its brevity, and couched in a style that is always attractive for its simplicity and charm, and that rises at times to real gripping eloquence.

The only criticism we would offer concerns the number of misprints. We have noticed five, one of which (" these " for " theses " on p. 105) destroys the meaning of the sentence.

J. CARTMELL.

Personal Religion. By Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J. pp. 134. (Sheed & Ward, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is a most excellent work, clear and masterly in exposition. Fr. de Grandmaison shows himself to be a competent guide in the ways of piety; he has a thorough knowledge of his subject, enriched and humanized by experience. His field of discussion is extensive, but he ranges with perfect ease.

After showing that religion is personal, but not individualistic, he treats of the essence and development of religion in piety, devotion, asceticism and mysticism. Piety he describes as the heart of religion, and he summarizes it in the filial attitude to God. Devotion is the fine flower of piety; it is piety in action, expressing itself towards God in worship, towards one's

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

In the Revue Des Deux Mondes (October 1st and 15th, 1931) Monsieur Emile Mâle, the Director of the Ecole Française de Rome, has written two articles full of erudition on "*The Gospels in Post-Tridentine Art.*" Mediæval religious art is disciplined, but one might have expected seventeenth century religious art to enjoy extraordinary freedom. A casual glance at the many pictures of the later Bolognese School (Caracci, Domenichino, Guido Reni) might lead one to suppose that individual fantasy was being given full play in the new Christian Art. That the fruit of St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises*, with its play of imagination in the composition of place would throw open the field of art to individual fantasy, and that so we should have as many ways of presenting the Annunciation or the Nativity as there were artists. On analysis, however, this is found to be far from being the case and a surprising uniformity dominates the depicting of religious scenes in the seventeenth century. It had an iconography of its own: details varied, indeed, but behind the genius of the individual painter the uniform theme of the century stands out.

Just as in the early Middle Ages two great currents of pictorial exposition are manifest: so in the seventeenth century two inspirations are manifest: that of the past and that of the present. It was an age of transition, and artists were not always sure which inspiration to follow. The legends of the past which, interwoven with the Gospel story, had inspired Mediæval artists were now being subjected to harsh criticism. Artists followed the tendencies of their patrons.

The new school of Iconography originated in Bologna with the Caracci, who themselves took it to Rome. There it acquired an almost canonical standing and spread throughout Catholic Europe under the influence of Cardinals, Bishops and high Ecclesiastics who wished to have pictures like those they had seen in the churches of Rome. During the greater part of the seventeenth century Rome was the artistic Capital of Europe.

Certain elements were borrowed from sixteenth century Italian art. For instance, Mediæval art never dared represent Our Lady with bare feet. The Renaissance had no such scruple. Michael Angelo's *Pietà* in St. Peter's had bare feet. The example swept over Europe. The traditional bald head of St. Paul did not appeal to Raphael: his St. Paul before the Areopagus has a thick head of hair. Again the example was followed. Thus traditional types disappeared, and new ones were made. The Michael Angelo figure of the Eternal Father in the Sistine Chapel was imitated: God borne up by His Angels is set forth by Sebastiano del Piombo, Francesco Salviati, Julius Romanus. It was adopted by Annibale Caracci and by

him passed on to his disciples. The Domenichino "Adam and Eve driven out of Paradise" in the Barberini Gallery is a good example of such imitation. The Eternal Father of Michael Angelo became that of Guido Reni and later of the French painters Simon Vouet, Poussin, Stella, and Le Brun.

Michael Angelo, again, with his disdain for traditional imagery depicted angels without wings. Imitation soon spread the fashion. Correggio in his frescoes on the cupola of the Cathedral of Parma shows us graceful adolescents and beautiful smiling children with nothing to distinguish them from the sons of men. Thereafter, legions of *putti* invade the Churches and altars and the pictures, and reduce Christian art to something almost mythological.

Not only were types changed, but the great artists' conceptions of certain scenes became stereotyped: Raphael's Transfiguration, Michael Angelo's Last Judgment create a new tradition.

Mediæval influences did not, however, entirely disappear. And in order to illustrate the old and the new in Christian art from the end of the sixteenth century M. Mâle studies in detail the pictures of the Annunciation and of the Nativity, the Adoration of the Magi and the Flight into Egypt, noting additional details and their omission.

The Renaissance artists had hidden the painful character of the scenes of the Passion, but in the seventeenth century they come to light once more with all the pathos of the fifteenth century. All the various discussions which have arisen about the details of the Crucifixion are reflected in the seventeenth century pictures. In passing M. Mâle mentions the so-called "Jansenistic Crucifix" as an entirely modern error. The Jansenists had no such crucifix in their monastery of Port Royal, but they are to be found in the churches of Rome. Rubens and Van Dyck painted many for the churches of Flanders, and Le Brun for the churches of Paris without their orthodoxy being called in question. This type of crucifix is long anterior to Jansenism and belongs to the later Middle Ages. The seventeenth century artists were but perpetuating a tradition.

The development of the scene of the taking down from the Cross is studied at length and the influence of Daniel da Volterra in his fresco in La Trinità de' Monti and of Rubens is made clear. The Pietà, the Entombment, Our Lady of Dolours, the Resurrection, *Noli me tangere* are studied in the works of the seventeenth century masters.

The general conclusion of M. Mâle's two articles is that an artistic conception more in harmony with the mind of the Church arose in Italy after the Council of Trent and spread throughout Catholic Europe; nevertheless, the new form of art did not completely extinguish the older forms of art.

In the October DUBLIN REVIEW, Michael de la Bedoyère gives a piquant account of the reactions of American thought to the works of Babbitt and More: *"Humanising" America. The*

Grotto Chapels of South Italy summarizes in pleasing form research work done by Miss Gertrude Robinson in a field she has made peculiarly her own. There are three literary articles: *Gerard Manley Hopkins, S.J.*, by Harman Grisewood; *A Catholic Writer* (M. E. Francis), by M. B.; and *Joseph Conrad: An Appreciation,* by Patrick Braybrooke. W. E. Campbell gives a pleasing sketch of *The First Abbot of Downside* (Hugh Ford). Father G. A. Elrington, O.P., writes on *Recent Psychological Literature.*

Father A. B. Sharpe contributes an analysis of *Professor A. E. Taylor's Gifford Lectures*, bringing out the unsoundness of not a few of the ideas underlying the work. He is trenchant in his treatment of Professor Taylor's vague conception of "conscience" and of his Patripassionist sympathies: "The book," he concludes, "though it contains much that is good and useful, as well as interesting in style and matter, cannot, it is to be feared, do anything considerable towards re-establishing religion among us."

Father Cuthbert's illuminating article on *The Origin of the Mendicant Orders* is no mere summary of historical data but a masterly survey of the trend of ideas in the great religious reform movement which began in the eleventh and culminated in the thirteenth century.

ETUDES for November 20th, 1931, treats the serious problem of *L'emploi des troupes indigènes et leur séjour en France.* M. Paul Catrice shows that there are some 50,000 native soldiers stationed at present in France—generally in the smaller towns. Their recruiting is not above suspicion, and the effect of their uprooting would appear to be thoroughly demoralizing. Alexandre Brou has compiled a very useful summary of the history of the movement led by Mar Ivanios, Archbishop of Bethany, and his Suffragan, Mar Theophilos: *Chez les Jacobites de Travancore.* M. Gaétan Bernoville writes a very sane account of *Les faits étranges d'Ezquioga*: the alleged apparitions of Our Lady have not been critically investigated and no ecclesiastical decision has been given, except in the case of an alleged "stigmatization" which was unfavourably reported upon by the Vicar-General of Vittoria on October 17th, 1931.

In the course of 1931 IRENIKON has published several articles of general interest. In the January number Père C. Bourgeois, writing on *Le problème de l'Unité sous le signe des Carpathes,* gives the first coherent explanation of the curious religious tendencies manifested since 1919 in the Carpathians. The trouble is cultural, not religious. The struggle is between Russian culture and Ukrainian culture, and the contention of the Ukrainians that the only safeguard of Christian Unity is their particular type of culture. Incidentally, Père Bourgeois puts his finger on one of the weaknesses of the Unity movement in the Near East: instead of grounding the education of their Clergy upon an Eastern Christian basis, they have tended to

become slavish imitators of the Latins looked upon as the prototypes of Catholic culture. In the March number Hiéromoine Pierre gives an account of *La Conférence interorthodoxe de Vatopédi*: its inception and the programme it has prepared for the Pro-synod to be held by the Orthodox in June, 1932. In the May number the same writer, dealing with *La délegation orthodoxe à la conference de Lambeth*, has brought together information derived largely from Eastern sources, which should not be overlooked by those who are interested in Anglo-Orthodox negotiations. In each number the *Chronique de l'Orthodoxie Russe* is filled with details of the practical working of Russian Orthodoxy and its Western reactions.

In the Nouvelle Revue Theologique for October, Père F. Hurth, S.J., writes a good Latin summary of the recent investigations of the Austrian Doctor Knaus and the Japanese Ogino on the alternations of physiological fecundity and infecundity in the menstrual cycle. In view of repercussion their conclusions would be likely to have in the field of Moral Theology if duly established, many priests will be glad to read the article *De Sterilitate Physiologica.*

The November number opens with a good account of the recent Apostolic Constitution on the re-organization of Higher Ecclesiastical Studies throughout the world. Fewer doctorates are likely to be conferred, but in future a doctorate is to be taken as signifying that its holder has shown that he is fitted for doing original work and is able to contribute to the progress of the science to which he is devoting his energies: the whole of his preparatory work must keep that end in view. The dissertation which is to be defended in public must be printed.

Writing on *Slavisme et l'Asie* Père Ch. Bourgeois draws attention to the absence of Russian Colonization, and to the natural eastwards expansion of Russian races who have never had any objection to amalgamating with the races they met in their progress across Asia.

The Ecclesiastical Review for November opens with a useful article by the Rev. James L. Connolly: *Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament*: Its history and present status.

The Swiss Catholic Nova et Vetera in *L' Etude chrétienne de l'expérience des Saints* gives us a handy bibliography of Catholic modern works on Mysticism by Père Lavaud, O.P. Charles Journet contrasts the Natural Social Order with the *Christian Social Order,* the conflict between the Modern world and the Christian world. *La Virginité de Marie et les Frères de Jésus*, by Max Overney, Professor of Exegesis at the Seminary of Fribourg, is a helpful setting out of Catholic teaching.

La Civilta Cattolica (November 7th), writing on *La Bufera Anticlericale Spagnuola*, gives some account of the debate on the suppression of the Jesuits. The utter unfairness of the English Press in dealing with present-day Spain can only be gauged by the study of the facts as given in Catholic Reviews

abroad. Padre Domenico Palmieri's Treatise *De Romano Pontifice* has just been revised and published by Father Joseph Filograssi, S.J., and is warmly commended.

Collationes Namurcenses (November) studies *La merveilleuse génération de Jésus,* this is followed by a careful though brief account of *Le Transformisme*: the present position of the problem presented by Evolution to the Catholic is analysed, the two broad lines of solution are indicated and the writer (F. Questiàux) is seen to be not entirely out of sympathy with the teaching of De Dorlodot, Perier, Teilhard de Chardin and Vialleton.

Revue Thomiste (November, 1931) opens with a study of Dom Lottin, O.S.B., on *La Psychologie de l'Acte humain chez saint Jean Damascène et les théologiens du XIII^e siècle occidental*—showing how the poverty of the terminology of the early translators and the strength of the reverence for Augustinian terminology retarded the use of the Eastern Doctor's framework, which in spite of the effort of assimilation of Albert the Great, St. Thomas left alone until 1270, only giving it serious consideration in the *Prima Secundae.* Professor Ed. Janssens, of the University of Liège, gives us a substantial study on *La coutume, source formelle de droit, d'après s. Thomas d'Aquin et d'après Suarez,* and brings out the extent to which the *Codex* has linked on to the old Gregory IXth tradition and set the theories of Suarez aside.

Père Gardeil treats *Questiones de nomenclature en matière de contemplation* in view of the criticisms aroused by his great work *La Structure de l'âme et l'expérience mystique.* His last article *La contemplation mystique* comes in the December number which opens with a brief In Memoriam article by Père Garrigou-Lagrange summing up his life's work.

E. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

Courting With a View to Mixed Marriage.

What is to be said of the fairly common practice of Catholics courting Protestants, and taking no account of the ecclesiastical law against mixed marriage, until they apply for a dispensation on the eve of the marriage? (W. V.)

The practice, as our correspondent says, is unfortunately common. When a dispensation is applied for, the real reason in the minds of the applicants is usually the fact that they love each other and wish to get married. Clearly this is not a *canonical* reason, and the priest has to exercise his mind in discovering one or more reasons which can honestly and justly be mentioned in the petition. The question, therefore, is whether the parties who act in this way, and presume on a dispensation being granted, are doing wrong.

(i) From one aspect of the matter the question can be answered easily and certainly. If there is danger to the faith of the Catholic or of the children, mixed marriages are forbidden not merely by the positive law of the Church but by the Divine law. " Severissime Ecclesia ubique prohibet ne matrimonium ineatur inter duas personas baptizatas, quarum altera sit catholica, altera vero sectae acatholicae seu schismaticae adscripta; quod si adsit perversionis periculum conjugis catholici et prolis, conjugium ipsum etiam lege divina vetatur " (Can. 1060). The prohibition of ecclesiastical law may be removed, provided that this danger to the faith is made sufficiently remote, by guarantees being given, *with moral certitude that they will be fulfilled* (Can. 1061.) Now, in certain cases of proposed mixed marriage, the Catholic party may know in his conscience, or at least suspect, that danger to the faith will not be removed, that the guarantees will not willingly be given, or if given that they will not be kept. A marriage entailing grave risks of this kind is prohibited by the Divine law. A Catholic who keeps company in such circumstances clearly commits grave sin, even though the marriage is subsequently tolerated by the Church, for the gravest reasons and in order to avoid graver evils.

(ii) Supposing, however, that the non-Catholic is prepared to give all the guarantees *ex animo,* that there is moral certitude concerning their faithful observance, and that both parties are absolutely prepared to do everything the Church requires; supposing, in addition, that there exists a canonical reason justifying the grant of a dispensation, even though this reason is not explicitly before the minds of the two parties; are we to say, even in this case, that it is sinful to keep company with a view to marriage, unless and until a dispensation has been obtained? The point is not an easy one to determine as so

much depends on the customs of different localities. In some dioceses there exists a diocesan rule against mixed marriage dispensations; they are not granted except for reasons such as *matrimonium civile jam contractum*. In other dioceses they are granted almost mechanically *servatis servandis*. The severe rule runs usually in those places where Catholics are numerous.

I will cite, firstly, the solution of this question given by a writer in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* who is distinguished for his careful and accurate replies to the queries of correspondents. "In our opinion, there is nothing sinful in 'keeping company' with a view to marriage, if the parties, Catholic and non-Catholic, are fully prepared to observe all the requirements of ecclesiastical law, and if there is a sufficiently grave reason why the marriage should be celebrated. We find it hard to believe that the Church would permit of a dispensation being granted, if the situation which required it *necessarily* implied the commission of grave sin. In other words, we hardly think that a mixed marriage, when the law has been fully complied with, is merely the lesser of two evils. The parties wish to marry for reasons which the Church considers sufficiently grave; the prohibition of the natural law has ceased; the ecclesiastical prohibition has been withdrawn. The marriage itself is opposed to no law; in entering it the parties violate no virtue. It is hard to see how they could sin, and sin grievously, by engaging in the necessary preliminaries." The writer, of course, explains that such company-keeping is often gravely sinful for the reasons given above (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* 1924, p. 410). I may add that the words "all the requirements of ecclesiastical law" may be taken to include the terms of a particular diocesan law refusing dispensations except for reasons of the gravest urgency. "Quapropter si Ordinarius pro sua dioecesi vel parochus, approbante Ordinario, pro sua paroecia propter bonum commune et ad vitandum scandalum pro foro externo tanquam regulam generalem statuerit, nunquam dandam esse dispensationem nisi in casu extraordinario ob causam objective gravem ex parte nupturientis; confessarius hanc praxim in foro quoque interno sequi tenetur, ac proinde penitentem, licet in bona fide existentem, monere de gravi peccato continuandi illas conversationes . . ." Ter Haar, *De Matrimoniis Mixtis,* n. 124).

(iii) The solution given by the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* has much to recommend it. It is straightforward and simple and no one wishes to manufacture sins and create fresh obligations and burdens for the shoulders of the faithful. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the constant warnings of the Church against mixed marriages, many of us would, perhaps, view the doctrine with just a little misgiving. For it does seem that the Church regards these dispensations, even when the law has been fully observed, as the lesser of two evils. "Ordinarii aliique animarum pastores: 1. fideles a mixtis nuptiis, quantum possunt, absterreant; 2. Si eas impedire non valeant, omni studio curent ne contra Dei et Ecclesiae leges

contrahantur" (Can. 1064). If it is objected that this applies to all dispensations, I think it must be said that mixed marriage is viewed with a special dislike because of the menace to the faith and the *bonum publicum,* which always exists in some measure even when it is made more remote by the guarantees being fully observed; but this danger does not exist at all when other impediments are dispensed. "In a mixed marriage, owing to the non-Catholic parent's influence, direct or indirect, the faith of the children is almost invariably weaker than that of their Catholic parent. The definite line of cleavage between truth and heresy becomes blurred, the *odium hæresis* almost disappears, and the wholesome abhorrence of mixed marriage is lost. In consequence, when the children of such a marriage are of marriageable age, they will contract a marriage as their Catholic parent did, with the still further enfeeblement of the faith of their children. Finally, with Catholic instincts all blunted, with a faith that has lost its power, following the footsteps of parent and grandparent, these children in still greater numbers contract mixed marriages. From these spring families that are nominally Catholic, and those distressing Protestant families bearing surnames which for generations had been associated with Catholic Ireland or Catholic Lancashire" (Instruction of the Archbishop of Liverpool, 1920, quoted by Ter Haar, *op. cit.*, p. 169).

Without, therefore, criticising adversely anyone who adopts the simple and direct solution given above under (ii), I think it should be interpreted on these lines. The grant of a dispensation depends on the gravity of the cause alleged in the petition; in addition, there is required not merely the signing of the guarantees, but also the moral certitude that they will be kept (Can. 1060, §1. 1). On both these points the axiom could be applied *nemo est judex in propria causa.* Parties, accordingly, who are contemplating a mixed marriage, cannot with a good conscience keep company, still less become engaged, unless they are assured by their parish priest that, in their case, a mixed marriage dispensation can be obtained. The parish priest, not the confessor *qua talis,* is the person to be consulted, because the grant of a marriage dispensation is normally an act of the external forum.

E. J. Mahoney.

Preparation for Marriage.

Is there not a Church law that those who intend to get married must pass an examination in the Catechism before the parish priest? (W. V.)

The law is contained in the following texts: *Rituale Romanum* Tit vii, Cap. i, n. 1 "Parochus, admonitus de aliquo Matrimonio contrahendo, primum cognoscat . . . et an in doctrina Christiana sufficienter instructi sint." The English *Ordo Administrandi* expresses the obligation more strongly (Tit. vii, cap. i, n. 1):

"Parochus diligenter inquirat . . . et uterque sciat rudimenta fidei, cum ea deinde filios suos docere teneantur." The reason is worth noting. It is not only that the recipient of a Christian Sacrament must know something about the faith, but also the fact that it is the duty of a Christian parent to teach the faith to their children. The law is thus expressed in Canon 1020, §2: "Tum sponsum tum sponsam etiam seorsum et caute interroget . . . an in doctrina Christiana sufficienter instructi sint, nisi ob personarum qualitatem haec ultima interrogatio inutilis appareat." This Canon is further explained by an answer of the Codex Commission, June 2nd and 3rd, 1918 (A.A.S., X, 1918, p. 345): "Si sponsa vel sponsus inveniantur ignari doctrinae Christianae, eritne locus eos respuendi a matrimonio, vel differendi matrimonium usque ad instructionem? Responsum est: Parochus servet praescriptum canonis 1020, §2; et dum ea peragit quae Codex peragenda praescribit, sponsos ignorantes sedulo edoceat prima saltem doctrinae christianae elementa: quod si renuant, non est locus eos respuendi a matrimonio ad normam canonis 1066." From these texts we may deduce:

(1) There is no obligation to put any questions at all on the subject, if the priest knows that the parties are sufficiently instructed, *e.g.*, if they are practising Catholics of his congregation. (2) In a given case of ignorance, the parish priest has an obligation to instruct the persons in the *elements* of Christian doctrine. But he is not bound to do this by putting them through an examination in the Catechism. It suffices that, with the time at his disposal, he teaches them the truths necessary *necessitate medii et precepti* for salvation, namely, the doctrines contained in the Creed, the Our Father, the commandments of God and of the Church, and the Sacraments of Baptism, Penance and Holy Eucharist. Having secured some elementary understanding of these doctrines before marriage, a fuller instruction could be deferred until afterwards. The strict obligation is to *offer*, on his part, an instruction in the elements of the faith before assisting at the marriage. (3) If they decline to be instructed, the law now is that they are not to be refused the sacrament of marriage precisely for this reason. In the mind of the Church still graver evils would result if such persons were turned away. It should be remarked that this more lenient attitude is rather a modern development. The older authors, following the teaching of Benedict XIV (De Synod. Dioc. VIII, c. xiv, n. 3), held that a person ignorant of the rudiments of the faith, and who does not learn them when well able to do so, is to be regarded as a public sinner, and, amongst other things, is to be forbidden the sacrament of Matrimony. This is the force of the reference to Can. 1060 in the reply of the Codex Commission, quoted above. Thus, the pre-Code De Smet *Betrothment and Marriage,* edition 1912, n. 331, gives this accepted doctrine. But the post-Code editions modify it in the manner explained, in accordance with the more recent instructions of the Holy See. E. J .M.

Plainsong for the People.

The Rev. A. McDonald, of Oscott, writes :—

I have been given to understand that a recent contribution of mine to this journal on the subject of Plainsong was taken to be an attack on a previous article by Fr. J. Turner on the same theme. I can assure all whom it may concern, including Fr. Turner, that this was not the case. The person I had in mind whilst writing was not Fr. Turner, but Pope Pius X and his desire that the Chant should be made the song of the people.

I have always been convinced that discussion of disputed questions in serial form is profitless, and I have long learnt that discussion of the Neo-Solesmes rhythmic theories generates more heat than light—hence my disavowal of any such purpose at the beginning of the article in question. My sole purpose was to express my conviction that the Society of St. Gregory has made a mistake in attempting to teach the Chant by the use of the Solesmes books. Whatever may be the value of Dom Mocquereau's theories, either historically or æsthetically, they undeniably tend to daunt the type of man, both clergy and laity, upon whom our hopes of reform depend. I, therefore, think their use unwise.

Since Fr. Turner has changed the ground of argument so as to include the Solesmes theories themselves, I may be allowed, perhaps, to point out that they are based upon data which competent critics have used to demonstrate quite opposite conclusions from those of Dom Mocquereau. Moreover the Holy See, whilst leaving the discussion of the rhythm of the Chant open to scholars, has provided us with an adequate guide to the interpretation it itself desires in the Introduction to the Gradual. These rules are described by the S.C.R. as being more than sufficient for an adequate rendering of the sacred melodies, and it is forbidden even to Ordinaries to impose any other than the official Editio Typica upon their subjects. This is more than a justification of my attitude.

Permissu Superiorum.

THE UNIVERSE

THE MOST WIDELY-READ CATHOLIC PAPER

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

The clergy will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

The clergy will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

The clergy will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

¶ Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other Catholic papers printed in the United Kingdom.

TWOPENCE WEEKLY.
By Post, 12s. 6d. per year.

1 ARUNDEL ST., LONDON, W.C.2

A CHRISTMAS LIST

Isabella of Spain

By WILLIAM WALSH

Demy 8vo. **15s. net**

"A story that will grip the imagination of the most phlegmatic reader . . . not only dramatic but historically accurate . . . Mr. Walsh takes his place alongside the great modern biographers."—*America.*

"It is extremely fortunate that so competent an author should have undertaken this particular task . . . a very real contribution to historical knowledge."—*Saturday Review.*

A CATHOLIC BOOK OF THE MONTH IN AMERICA: RECOMMENDED BY THE CARDINAL HAYES LITERATURE COMMITTEE.

March, Kind Comrade

By the Very Rev. R. H. STEUART, S.J.

7/6 net

"An interesting and vividly descriptive book, dispassionate yet human, and entirely free from hysterics, which deserves a place of its own in the literature of the War."—*Glasgow Herald.*"

A Sheed & Ward Anthology

5/- net

"A cross-section of Catholic thought which could hardly be bettered."—*Everyman.*

"It is as comprehensive a survey of the more recent Catholic literature as we have yet seen, whilst the extracts have been selected . . . with intelligence and care."—*Catholic Times.*

The Ark Library

(3/6 net each)

The Thing

By G. K. CHESTERTON

"The most brilliant of modern apologists here . . . with a single blade makes dazzling play against a whole horde of opponents."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

Caliban in Grub Street

By RONALD KNOX

"This book is chockful of wisdom, and adds both to the sanity and joy of life."—*Sunday Dispatch.*

"Acute and clearheaded, to say nothing of his lively wit."—*Manchester Guardian.*

The Secret of the Cure D'Ars

By HENRI GHÉON

"Piercingly interesting."—*Guardian.* "Brilliant and animated."—*Daily Telegraph.*

"In this short book Ghéon has brought his art to perfection."—*Dublin Review.*

By The Way

By BEACHCOMBER

7/6 net

"A huge thunderous wind of elemental and essential laughter."—G. K. Chesterton.

"Nothing like this volume has ever appeared before—this delicious collection of parodies, verses, squibs, bombshells, insults, satires and stories."—*News Chronicle.*

SHEED & WARD, 31, Paternoster Row, E.C.4

Gibbs & Bamforth, Ltd., Printers, St. Albans, Herts.